Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. VIII OCTOBER, 1937 No. 10

The Pastor and Synod

Naturally the pastor's paramount interest centers in his congregation. This is as it should be. It is the congregation which calls him and exacts a pledge from him to serve it unselfishly with the Word of God and the Sacraments. It is the membership of the congregation which forms the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made him overseer to feed the Church of God which He has purchased with His own blood, Acts 20, 28. Again, it is the congregation which has pledged itself to respect him as the pastor and to supply all his temporal needs. Again, according to Scripture the congregation is a divine institution. Christ acknowledged this in Matt. 18, 17. The Apostle St. Paul recognized this in addressing the congregation in Corinth as "the church of God which is at Corinth," 1 Cor. 1, 2. St. John, in Revelation, addressed his letters to separate congregations when he wrote "unto the angel of the church" at Ephesus, Smyrna, etc.

A synod is not a divine institution, but a voluntary organization. Nowhere is there a Scriptural command that congregations must unite. Of course, we have the Scriptural example, Acts 15, of the first convention of delegates from congregations which assembled at Jerusalem. There are features in this sacred account which remind a person of one of our synodical conventions. We notice, for instance, that there were delegates who had been dispatched from the congregation at Antioch for the purpose of consulting with the apostles and elders at Jerusalem about a doctrinal dispute which had arisen in their midst. At this convention there was a great multitude in attendance, which is more than an indication that there were lay delegates present. Attention is called also to the fact that Paul and Barnabas were given an opportunity to report on their missionary activities among the Gentiles. A very important feature — which, by the way, has been one of the chief characteristics of our synodical conventions

and which undoubtedly has preserved unity of doctrine in our midst — is the doctrinal discussion which was held there. After free and frank expressions, which revealed a very pronounced difference of opinion, they reached a God-pleasing conclusion on the basis of the revealed Word of God and thus maintained true unity of the spirit. Yet, despite all these points of similarity we nevertheless must recognize the truth that there is no express command that congregations must unite into an organization such as a synod.

However, under circumstances which prevailed at the time when our Lutheran fathers came to our shores it became very apparent that closer relationship among the various congregations that were established must be maintained. The fathers realized that, even as burning coals must needs be kept together if they are not to be extinguished, so congregations in different parts of our country might not continue in soundness of doctrine, in fervency of spirit, etc., unless they united into a synodical organization. Under prevailing conditions today, where the forces of evil have renewed their efforts and are launching most bitter attacks, whose aim and objective is the destruction of the Christian religion, we could hardly get along without a synod. If we had no synod, we would undoubtedly organize one. As Christians in our various congregations we would feel the urge and the necessity of affiliation with our fellow-Lutherans in other congregations in the various parts of our country and the world. The same reasons that prompted our fathers to organize a synod undoubtedly would move us to take such steps today. We would look to the "example of the Apostolic Church in Acts 15." Again, we would recognize "our Lord's will that the diversities of gifts should be for the common profit," 1 Cor. 12, 4—31. (Synodical Constitution.)

In Eph. 4 the Lord expressly urges His Christians to "endeavor to keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." While this might be accomplished without synodical organization, yet it must be apparent to every one who reflects upon this matter seriously that synodical organization is of inestimable benefit in the accomplishment of that assigned purpose. Let us consider well the tremendous advantages afforded our fathers by the fact that they had others to whom they might turn and with whom they might discuss the weighty problems which confronted them during their doctrinal controversies. Let us not underestimate but evaluate properly the remarkable benefits derived from synodical conventions and conferences, where doctrinal discussions are given such an important place. It can hardly be gainsaid that this has contributed very much toward our synodical unity and, next to God's

grace, has been the outstanding factor in preventing disharmony and disruption. We cannot thank God sufficiently for these blessings which have come to us through our Synod.

With reference to the "diversities of gifts to be used for the common profit" we surely must admit that this has been a very prominent factor in our synodical life. Even prior to the organization of our Synod it was very apparent that God used the diversity of talents so evident in Walther, Wyneken, Sihler, Craemer, and others. Our century of activity has added many illustrious names to that list of men whom God endowed with particular talents that in all humility they might place these at the foot of Christ's cross and into the service of His kingdom.

Again, the needs and requirements in that enormous task which the Church has been commissioned to perform call for a diligent use of these different talents. In order to accomplish this properly, it is so essential that there be united effort. No individual Christian, and for that matter no individual congregation, could assume full responsibility for the performance of those duties which Christ assigned to His Church when He requested her to preach the Gospel to every creature and to go into all the world in order to accomplish this. This necessitates, as experience has demonstrated it, the establishment of schools where the future pastors, teachers, and missionaries of the Church might receive their training for the work of the Christian ministry. Again, it necessitates the sending of laborers that have been thus trained into the fields "white already to harvest." Of course, only God can send them, but He does this through His Church. Surely, when we contemplate the immensity of such a program, we shall recognize some compelling reasons for the organization of our Synod.

Let us add to the aforesaid the thought that Bibles, books to be used in church and school, and all manner of Christian literature must be published and disseminated. We could hardly visualize an effective performance of our great mission to the world today without such literature.

Since the Church is viewed by the world, and judged largely also by her practise and customs, "the largest possible uniformity in church-practise, church-custom, and in general, in congregational affairs" (Syn. Const.) is greatly desirable. While no perfection has been achieved, yet much has been accomplished, and this could hardly have been achieved without synodical organization.

Again, "the supervision of the ministers and teachers of the Synod with regard to the performance of their official duties, as well as the protection of pastors, teachers, and congregations in

the performance of their duties and the maintenance of their rights" (Syn. Const.) is certainly necessary if the Church is to continue in purity of doctrine and uniformity of practise. However, also this can best be accomplished through the organization of a synod. We may even say that our congregations can hardly dispense with the remarkable service rendered by Synod. Where is the congregation which could educate and train faithful pastors to serve it and also men whom she might dispatch to mission-fields at home and abroad? Let us not underestimate the training of soundly orthodox pastors and teachers, which God has wrought at our synodical institutions. What a blessing to have such an organization as a synod to which congregations may turn during vacancies to suggest to them faithful and conscientious pastors and teachers whose orthodoxy is proved and established. Surely we should feel constrained to organize a synod if we did not have one.

Our fathers were extremely careful in organizing our Synod. They safeguarded the sovereignty of the congregation. They considered not merely that Synod is a voluntary organization, but also that it could function only in an advisory capacity. They effected an organization which was truly democratic. Our Synod cannot legislate, can levy no taxes, can exercise no compulsion by which congregations may be forced to join, can assign no pastors to congregations, cannot expel pastors from office, can pass and enforce no laws in adiaphora, can exercise no control over the property of congregations, cannot dictate congregational policies, cannot interfere in the government of the congregation, but must ever respect the sovereignty of the congregation itself. Only the Word of God can legislate for the congregation. When this whole matter is viewed in the light of Scripture, it becomes apparent that God endowed our fathers with genuine wisdom when they adopted the Constitution and By-laws, in which the principles and policies of the proper relationship between Synod and congregations, hence also between Synod and the pastors of the congregations, was established.

The truly democratic character of our synodical organization makes it all the more urgent that our pastors understand not merely their own and their congregations' privileges, but also their duties and responsibilities over against Synod.

With regard to the democratic government in our country some have expressed misgivings. We hear much complaint from the lips of some fellow-citizens against certain practises which prevail, and usually such people add: "Our Government should do something about that." Apart from such complaints, however, they themselves are altogether indifferent about the affairs of

government. Such indifference is decidedly dangerous. It may undermine the very foundations upon which our Government rests. In fact, on account of this some claim that no democracy can continue, but must ultimately collapse. Undoubtedly many of our statesmen, political economists, editors of newspapers and magazines, and others realize the insidious danger which lurks in such indifference. It is pathetic that even during a national campaign, with all its efforts to arouse people to action, hardly seven out of ten of our citizens who enjoy the privilege of the ballot will take the trouble to go to the polls. Other selections reveal much greater apathy. Such indifference is dreadfully dangerous.

Even so some have declared that our Synod cannot continue because of its democratic character. From its very beginning there were those who predicted confusion and collapse not merely because of its unwavering adherence to God's Word in matters of doctrine, but also because of the organizational structure. To say the very least, it is most remarkable that under such emphatic insistence upon congregational sovereignty our Synod has not merely continued, but enjoyed a marvelous growth. We know of course that all credit and glory belongs to God, whose powerful Word has been the magnetic force to keep the congregations of our Synod intact in such remarkable soundness of doctrine. Let us not forget, however, that God used human instruments to accomplish this. Next to the grace of God we need to recognize the faithful and conscientious loyalty, the unswerving orthodoxy, of that host of consecrated pastors and teachers as the outstanding contributing factor toward the preservation and expansion of our Synod. They, in turn, indoctrinated the laity and exhorted them to be truly loyal, and enthusiastically so. When Dr. Walther exclaimed, "Gott erhalte uns ein frommes Ministerium," he paid the ministry of Synod a high compliment. He understood what an important and responsible position our ministers had occupied and how faithfully and conscientiously they had performed their tasks. At the same time he voiced the truth that also in the future the welfare of Synod would depend, next to the grace of God, upon pious and faithful servants of the Word.

This emphasizes the great importance of the pastor's loyalty to his Synod. Unless he is loyal to it, — and it deserves his loyalty, — how can he expect his members to manifest loyalty? Our generation of pastors, which has entered into the heritage of the fathers without any special effort or any inward struggle, is inclined to take very much for granted. We shall do well to subject ourselves to an honest examination, to make a fearless audit, and thus to come to a keener realization and a deeper appreciation of the blessings which God has showered upon us

through our Synod. We shall then arrive at this conclusion: Next to God and my Christian parents, who gave me my early Christian training, I am indebted to my beloved Synod. It furnished the Christian teacher who taught me in the parochial school, the pastor who instructed and confirmed me, the professors at whose feet I was permitted to sit at college and at the seminary. It furnished the catechism, the Bible history, the hymnal, and many other books which I needed for my elementary, higher, and theological education. It carried on the mission-work which led to my call, my ordination, and the wonderful privilege of being an ambassador of Christ. Consequently I dare not be indifferent about its welfare or even assume the attitude "My Synod owes me," but rather, "I am indebted to my Synod. I owe it support, loyalty, service."

Having voluntarily become a member of Synod, a pastor should be thoroughly informed about the organization which he joined. Above all should he be thoroughly acquainted with, and whole-heartedly subscribe to, the doctrines of his Synod, and this should be based upon the firm conviction that these fully agree with the Word of God. He should possess more than a passing knowledge of the doctrinal controversies through which his Synod was compelled to pass and gratefully rejoice that God graciously kept it with the truths of the Bible. He must know something of the history of his Synod, its beginnings, its struggles, its growth. He should be well acquainted with its Constitution and By-laws, its form of government, its customs and practises. He should give serious and constructive thought to the problems and difficulties confronting it. He should be vitally interested in its activities and undertakings, its program of elementary and higher education, its missions at home and in foreign fields, the support it is giving to the Veterans of the Cross, etc.

Next must follow unstinted and unflinching support. Sometimes a pastor will hear harsh criticism uttered against his Synod. Even as with citizens who criticize our Government, so also criticism voiced against Synod usually comes from such members as otherwise manifest no active interest in it. They criticize very sharply and destructively, but neither offer nor do anything of a constructive nature. A faithful pastor will then come to the defense of his Synod. It may require courage, but he loves it so intensely that he cannot bear to have any one malign or harm it. After all, if he does not defend it and speak well of it, who shall do it?

The faithful pastor must work for the welfare of Synod in his congregation. Of necessity Synod looks to him to do this. Again we ask, If the pastor does not arouse interest for Synod in his congregation, who shall do it? This is becoming increasingly

difficult in our day, especially in larger congregations. So many of our members are not in church when the pastor imparts information; so few of our people read our church periodicals; so many have practically no conception of what their Synod is, of its activities, its needs, and consequently they take no interest in the work of the Church at large. However, though it is difficult, the faithful pastor will find ways and means, will perhaps enlist the cooperation of willing workers in the congregation, to reach, to impart information to, and to make enthusiastic, each member of his congregation for the work his Synod is doing.

In this connection a word may be in place about efforts put forth jointly with other congregations. Synod passes a resolution which urges every congregation to cooperate in some special endeavor. Some congregations then desire to insist upon their sovereign rights and declare: "We shall not take part in this. Synod must not dictate to us." Let us consider well that congregations and their pastors joined Synod voluntarily. Thereby they not merely signed the Constitution and thus subscribed to the principles and policies expressed therein, but also assumed certain obligations. Cooperation and support are such obligations. Of course, special circumstances may prevent the execution of the plan at a certain time or in a certain manner; but wherever possible, pastors should strive for such cooperation. Besides, such plans and programs are sufficiently flexible to adapt them to the particular conditions which may exist here or there.

Of course, congregations should cooperate in the work of the Church at large by their financial contributions. While a person often hears the remark "Let Synod do it," and while this attitude is apparent also in some of the rousing resolutions passed at District or synodical conventions which involve the expenditure of sums of money, yet every one who considers such matters seriously must know that Synod can do only as much as congregations permit it to do, and that permission is expressed very definitely in terms of their contributions. Our pastors are Synod's contact men. Synod must of necessity depend upon them to present the needs of the Church at large to the people. This does not mean that the pastor must serve as collector for Synod (though the writer remembers well how years ago many pastors willingly assumed that obligation and made the rounds in the congregation for an old-fashioned *Hauskollekte*). However, the pastor as leader of the congregation must impart the information and then apply the Word of God, especially the precious Gospel of our crucified Redeemer, which is the urgent, compelling motive to render hearts and hands willing to give liberally. It will not do merely to state, "We shall have a collection for Synod's budget."

That is so mechanical, so cold, and to many of our people so meaningless. That will not enkindle their hearts and open their purses. Pastors must lead their people to see the "facts behind the figures" and then urge and encourage and convince them with the Gospel of Christ. Again, though this is difficult, pastors should make arrangements that every member will be reached in a systematic way and given an opportunity to enjoy the privilege of placing also a proper portion of their temporal possessions into the service of Christ's kingdom.

This is certainly a most propitious time to restudy the proper relationship of the pastor and his congregation to Synod. We are approaching the centennial of the landing of the founders of our beloved Synod. Within a few years, God willing, we shall celebrate the centennial of the organization of Synod. We are entering upon a second century of soundly Lutheran church activity in America. What accomplishments this second century will record will depend, next to God and His gracious blessings, upon the genuine orthodoxy, the unflinching loyalty, the consecrated service, the aggressive activity, and the whole-hearted support of Synod's pastors. "May God preserve unto us a pious ministry!"

Oak Park, Ill. J. W. Behnken

Schrift, Bekenntnis, Theologie, Pfarramt und verwandte Gegenstände

Es liegt uns eine Anzahl theologischer Hefte zur Besprechung vor, die wir nicht gerne mit der allgemeinen Bemerkung abfertigen möchten: „Hier wird uns manches Treffliche dargeboten." Davon hat der Leser nicht viel geistigen Gewinn. Die genannten Gegenstände sind ja so wichtig, daß das, was angesehene Theologen der Gegenwart darüber zu sagen haben, etwas eingehender besprochen werden dürfte, als das im Rahmen einer gewöhnlichen Rezension geschehen könnte. Wenn wir sehen, daß auch in andern Kreisen auf Dinge, die bei uns allbekannt sind, Nachdruck gelegt wird, so hat das seinen Nutzen. Und wenn uns verkehrte Urteile und Grundsätze entgegentreten, so mahnt uns das, um so fester an der aus der Schrift erkannten, an der Schrift geprüften Wahrheit festzuhalten. Die Schriften, die wir jetzt in der Form eines Artikels — der naturgemäß kein formgerechter theologischer Aufsatz sein kann — besprechen wollen, sind die folgenden:

Theologia Militans. A. Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Leipzig. 1936. 1937.

8. Heft. O. Procksch. „Das Bekenntnis im Alten Testament." 28 Seiten. M. .75.

9. Heft. Werner Elert. „Schrift und Bekenntnis." 22 Seiten. M. .65.

10. Heft. Martin Dörne. „Lutherisches Pfarramt. Rechenschaft und Wegweisung." 44 Seiten. M. 1.12.

11. Heft. Otto Henning Nebe. „Kämpfende Theologie." 23 Seiten. M. .49.

12. Heft. Rudolf Hermann. „Deutung und Umdeutung der Schrift." Ein Beitrag zur Frage der Auslegung. 33 Seiten. M. .90.

13. Heft. Franz Lau. „Das Heil des Volkes und das Evangelium. Geistlicher und leiblicher Segen." Ein Beitrag zu dem Thema: Luther und die Gegenwart. 22 Seiten. M. .65.

Luther und das Recht. Hermann Wolfgang Beyer. („Die Lehre Luthers." Texthefte, herausgegeben im Auftrage der Luther-Gesellschaft. 4. Heft.) Chr. Kaiser Verlag, München. 62 Seiten. M. 1.70.

Was Procksch in dem Aufsatz **„Das Bekenntnis im Alten Testament"** über die Notwendigkeit und den Nutzen des kirchlichen Bekenntnisses sagt, ist zumeist gut. Die Kirche muß ein „fest begrenztes Bekenntnis" haben, „um den Kampf mit ihren Gegnern siegreich zu bestehen" (S. 528). Die Kirche darf selbstverständlich „Schrift und Bekenntnis niemals einander gleichsetzen, als enthalte das kirchliche Bekenntnis in sich eine göttliche Norm"; aber hat sie ein *christliches* Bekenntnis („Es ist eine und dieselbe Wahrheit, die in der Schrift verkündigt und im Bekenntnis bekannt wird") und steht sie darauf, so ist sie imstande, ihre Gegner zu entlarven und die Lüge zu überwinden. Nicht gut ist, was Procksch über die Entstehung des Alten Testaments sagt. Da redet eben die höhere Kritik. Und die höhere Kritik zwingt ihre Jünger, auch diejenigen, die der konservativen Richtung angehören, von einer wirklichen Inspiration der Heiligen Schrift abzusehen. Wer da glaubt (Procksch sagt: „Wir *wissen* heute") „daß das Gesetz in seiner pentateuchischen Schlußgestalt nicht von Mose niedergeschrieben ist, daß es sich aus mindestens drei Gesetzbüchern verschiedener Herkunft zusammensetzt und daß Esra diese Gesetzbücher unter Moses Namen stellte" (S. 13), wird sich hüten, diese Handlungsweise Esras dem Heiligen Geiste zuzuschreiben. Und die Motive, die Esra in seiner Redaktionsarbeit leiteten („Die Thora war die Rechtfertigung des jüdischen Volkes im persischen Reiche. Sie durfte keinen politischen Konfliktstoff gegenüber diesem Reiche enthalten. Die Belebung der messianischen Hoffnung durch das öffentliche Bekenntnis des Judentums wäre nicht im Sinne des Staates gewesen", S. 16), passen natürlich nicht in die Inspirationslehre. Procksch kann darum nicht sagen: Die Schrift *ist* Gottes Wort. Was er konstant sagt, ist: „Hinter der Schrift steht das Wort" (S. 3. 13). Der schöne Satz: „Es ist eine und dieselbe Wahrheit, die in der Schrift verkündigt und im Bekenntnis bekannt wird" verliert darum seinen gewaltigen Inhalt. Mit einer Wahrheit, die nicht aus der Schrift an sich geschöpft ist, sondern aus

dem vagen, hinter der Schrift stehenden Worte Gottes erwiesen werden muß, kann man im Kampfe gegen die Gegner der Kirche nichts ausrichten.

Über den Inhalt des Alten Testaments wird manches Treffliche gesagt: So z. B.: „überall, das Passah eingeschlossen, handelt es sich letztlich um die Versöhnung, die ohne Stellvertretung nicht denkbar ist. . . . Zur Versöhnung ist ein vollkommenes Menschenopfer in Stellvertretung für das verschuldete Menschenleben nötig." (S. 12. 28.) Daneben finden sich Ausführungen, die ein Lutheraner nicht niederschreiben durfte. So wird z. B. der Kernspruch von der Rechtfertigung Gen. 15, 6 so exegesiert: „Die Gerechtigkeit Gottes ist die sittliche Weltordnung, die Gerechtigkeit des Menschen die Einordnung in diese Welt, der Glaube die Kraft, diese Einordnung zu vollziehen." (S. 11.) Welcher Satz im lutherischen Bekenntnis gibt dieser Definition von der Glaubensgerechtigkeit Deckung? Dasselbe gilt von der auf S. 28 gegebenen Auslegung von Ps. 51, 19: „Das Versöhnungsopfer, das vor Gott gilt, besteht nicht im Tieropfer, das als Ersatz für den Menschen getötet wird, sondern in der Selbstaufopferung des ganzen menschlichen Ich, das vom Geiste Gottes neugeschaffen wird."

Was in der Abhandlung **„Schrift und Bekenntnis"** über die Autorität der Bekenntnisse und das Verhältnis von der Bekenntnisautorität zur Schriftautorität gesagt wird, soll man sich hüben wie drüben merken.

1. Die lutherische Kirche verpflichtet ihre Lehrer allerdings auf die Bekenntnisse. Und sie ist dazu von Gott verpflichtet. „Die Theologen, die 1537 die Schmalkaldischen Artikel unterzeichneten, unterschrieben dabei auch den Satz, daß sie ‚gemäß den Artikeln der (Augsburgischen) Konfession und der Apologie dächten und in ihren Kirchen lehrten (sentire et docere)'. Schon zu Luthers Lebzeiten, in seinem Beisein und unter seiner Billigung, haben also führende Theologen den reformatorischen Bekenntnissen die Geltung einer Lehrnorm zuerkannt. . . . Dies bedeutet eine Lehrverpflichtung für die Träger des geistlichen Amtes." (S. 4. 14.)

2. Die Autorität der Bekenntnisse beruht aber ausschließlich auf der Autorität der Schrift. Die lutherische Kirche koordiniert keineswegs die Bekenntnisse der Schrift (S. 4). „Niemals kann es Urteile zur geltenden Kirchenlehre erheben, die vom Evangelium aus nicht begründet werden können." „Die Lehrentscheidung der Kirche erfolgt nicht in eigener Autorität, sondern nur unter der Autorität der Schrift." „Die letzte Entscheidung über Glauben und Bekennen liegt nicht in den Dogmen, sondern in der Heiligen Schrift." „Die Bekenntnisautorität steht immer im Dienst der Schriftautorität, und sie reicht nur so weit, als es durch diese gedeckt wird." (S. 12. 16. 19. 22.)

Hieraus folgt 3., daß „eine Lehre, die kein Bekenntnis zum Evangelium ist, niemals geltende Kirchenlehre werden kann" (S. 21). Das heißt, keine Kirche hat das Recht, auf ihre Lehre zu verpflichten, wenn

diese Lehre nicht die Wiederholung und Wiedergabe der betreffenden Schriftaussagen, nicht ein Bekenntnis zur Schrift ist. Keine Kirche hat das Recht, auf eine falsche Lehre zu verpflichten, wenn diese Lehre auch in tausend Bekenntnisschriften niedergelegt und sanktioniert wäre. Es hat in dieser Hinsicht keinen Sinn, wenn man heutzutage in Deutschland lobend von „Bekenntniskirchen" redet. Die reformierten Bekenntnisse, insoweit sie die reformierten Irrlehren vortragen, bestehen vor Gott nicht zu Recht.

4. „Die Gemeinsamkeit in der Anerkennung der Schriftautorität verbürgt keineswegs die Kircheneinheit." (S. 17.) Alle protestantischen Kirchengemeinschaften bekennen sich zu dem sola Scriptura, und dabei verbreiten sie, mit einer Ausnahme, unbiblische Lehren, weigern sich, ein Bekenntnis zu unterschreiben. Die unionistische Rede „Wir brauchen keine Bekenntnisschriften; wir bekennen uns ja alle zur Heiligen Schrift" ist der Deckmantel — ein allzu durchsichtiger Deckmantel — für die denkbar größte Uneinigkeit. Noch eins: aus eben dieser Sachlage erwächst die Notwendigkeit der Bekenntnisschriften. Sie stellen an den falschen Lehrer die Gewissensfrage: Du berufst dich auf die Schrift; nimmst du auch tatsächlich an, was die Schrift wirklich lehrt? Die Kirche ist verpflichtet, durch ihre Bekenntnisse diese Frage zu stellen. Gott fordert von der Kirche, daß sie nur solche Lehrer zuläßt, die sich offen zu der von den falschen Lehrern geleugneten Schriftlehre bekennen, 1 Joh. 4, 1; 1 Petr. 3, 15; Matth. 10, 32.

5. Eben deswegen „bedarf die geltende Kirchenlehre einer im Wortlaut festgelegten Formulierung" (S. 12. Sperrdruck im Original). Das heißt einmal, daß mit unionistischen, zweideutigen, dehnbaren Formeln der Kirche nicht gedient ist. Und weiter: Die vor etlichen Jahrhunderten im Wortlaut festgelegte Formulierung gilt heute noch! Der Modernist muß das Apostolische Symbolium in seinem Wortlaut annehmen — oder ehrlich verwerfen. Und der Lutheraner darf nicht sagen, daß, was z. B. die Schmalkaldischen Artikel wörtlich so formuliert haben, historisch verstanden werden müsse, nach dem Wortlaut heute nicht gerade so gelte.

6. „Was von Amts wegen in der Kirche geredet wird, kann und muß die Öffentlichkeit auch der ganzen Kirche zu Last legen." (S. 7.) Man darf nicht sagen: Diese Publikation ist eine Privatpublikation; dieses Seminar gehört einer Privatgesellschaft; dieser falsche Lehrer kann nur von seinem Distrikt, nicht von dem allgemeinen Körper, zur Rechenschaft gezogen werden.

7. Elert bespricht auch den unsinnigen „Satz, daß die formulierten Dogmen die Christenheit spalten, während die Schrift sie einige", sowie auch „die Meinung Söderbloms, daß der Glaube die Menschen trenne, aber die Liebe sie verbinde" (S. 18). „Auch die Augustana war nicht die Ursache der Kirchenspaltung im Reformationsjahrhundert." Schade, daß wir den ganzen Passus hier nicht zitieren können. — Der

Satz auf S. 9 „Man kann sich hier den Unterschied von Kirche und Sekte klar machen: in einer Sekte reden alle dasselbe" könnte leicht mißverstanden werden.

D. Martin Dörnes **„Lutherisches Pfarramt"** ist eine feine kleine Pastorale. Sie warnt den Pfarrer vor klerikalen Gelüsten. Gleich der erste Satz lautet: „über die lutherische ‚Pastorenkirche' klagt man bereits seit einem Jahrhundert. . . . Hinter den agitatorischen Schlagworten ‚Pastorenkirche' und ‚Pfaffentum' stehen Wirklichkeiten." Und wir lesen weiterhin: „Die lutherische Reformation war einmal die erbarmungslose Zerstörung der Lüge von einem heiligen Kirchenstande. . . . Luther: ‚Alle Christen sind wahrhaftig geistlichs Stands und ist unter ihnen kein Unterschied denn des Amts halben allein' (W. A. 6, 407). . . . Ein hochkirchliches Luthertum sehe zu, wie es mit diesen Sätzen des Reformators fertig wird." (S. 6.) Sie warnt ihn auch vor der Verweltlichung seines Amts. „Man hat gemeint, es werde eine neue Ära der Kirche anfangen, wenn erst der neue Typus des ‚volkstümlichen' oder, wie man heute zu sagen vorzieht, des ‚Volks'-Pfarrers sich durchgesetzt habe. . . . Am Ende dieses Weges steht der Pfarrer, der nur in den Häusern der Fröhlichen und der Maßgebenden in seiner Gemeinde anzutreffen ist; der Pfarrer, der beliebt ist, weil er es den Menschen leicht macht, das Evangelium mit Weltverklärung und das Reich Gottes mit dem Reich ihrer eigenen Wünsche zu verwechseln." (S. 4.) Sie warnt ihn schließlich — „es scheint in unsern Tagen ein förmlicher Teufelskreis von pastoralen Irrungen ins Drehen gekommen zu sein" — vor dem Versuch, „mit einer archaisierenden Sprache, mit dem Lutherrock und mit ‚kultischer' Haltung die Kirche retten zu wollen" (S. 35).

Unsere kleine Pastorale mahnt den Prediger zur Treue in der Ausrichtung der Hauptfunktion seines Amtes: der Verkündigung des Worts; dazu gehört genaue Kenntnis der reinen Lehre und fortgesetztes tiefgehendes Studium der Heiligen Schrift. Dörne legt erst dar, wie „Luther von den sachlichen Anforderungen der Schriftauslegung redet, zu denen er mit beharrlichem Nachdruck auch die Kenntnis der biblischen Grundsprachen rechnet, daß selbst da, wo er die Aufteilung der Aufgaben des Wortamts zwischen einem Stande ‚gemeiner Pfarrherren' und einem Stand theologisch durchgebildeter Pfarrer erwägt (15, 49; 30, II, 545 ff.), er bei der Forderung bleibt: ‚Aber latinisch müssen die gemeinen Pfarrher und Prediger können und mügen des nicht entbehren', und daß ‚die Hauptsache an der Ordination ursprünglich die Prüfung in der Lehre' war". Und dann charakterisiert er „diese strenge Bindung des kirchlichen Amtes an das Wort und an die reine Lehre" als „diesen stark theologischen Charakter des lutherischen Predigtamtes" (S. 15). Ja, „Lutherisches Amtsverständnis kennt keine Pfarrer, die nicht auch Theologen wären" (S. 42). In diesem Zusammenhang hören wir die zeitgemäße, beherzigenswerte Erinnerung: „Es ist allein diese lutherische

Amtslehre, die dem Pfarrer, der in unsern Tagen von der Fülle der Geschäfte, der Vereine, der Verwaltung fast erdrückt und zerrieben zu werden droht, das gute Gewissen gibt, sich Zeit zu nehmen, sich die Kräfte frei zu halten für die Haupt- und Grundfunktionen seines Dienstes, für die Sonntagspredigt und das an ihr vorausgesetzte Schriftstudium, für den Jugendunterricht und endlich für die persönliche Seelsorge, und zwar für eine Seelsorge, die sich nicht in einer Rekordzahl von Hausbesuchen erschöpft." (S. 30.) „Darum soll und muß es für Pastoren wieder eine gute Selbstverständlichkeit werden, daß für tägliche Schriftlesung und tägliches Gebet Zeit frei bleibe, und dies nicht nur in der Form einer allgemeinen Hausandacht." (S. 39.) Und hierin soll er sich nicht stören lassen durch das Geschrei: „Pfarrer, du müßtest alle moderne Wissenschaft und Weisheit kennen!" (S. 39). Betreffs der Forderung und des Vorwurfs: „Pfarrer, du müßtest viel aktiver sein!" (S. 39) wird S. 29 auch dies gesagt: „Man versteht Luther falsch, wenn man seiner ‚Kirche des Wortes' eine Kirche, ein Christentum der ‚Tat' gegenüberstellt. Allerdings liegt in der lutherischen Versuchungslinie die Kirche, in der nur noch geredet wird. Aber das ist dann nicht Luthertum, sondern Pseudoluthertum. Der Primat des Wortes besagt nicht, daß der lutherische Pfarrer weniger tun soll als etwa seine angelsächsischen Amtsbrüder. Er besagt nur, daß er das, was er tut, nicht anders tun kann als mit dem lebendigen, wirkenden Wort Gottes." Und wo und wie soll nun der Pfarrer „tätig" sein? In der Sphäre der sozialen Reform? Aber doch in nationalen und internationalen Zusammenkünften kirchlicher Verbindungen? Ja, wenn er dazu berufen ist. Aber das eigentliche Gebiet seiner Tätigkeit liegt wo anders. Du möchtest doch auch etwas *Großes* im Reich Gottes ausrichten? Höre: „Das Pastorenamt im geordneten Kirchspiel führt nicht heraus aus der Sturmzone der großen Entscheidungen an der vordersten Front. Im Gegenteil, gerade hier in diesem Kirchspiel fallen die eigentlichen Entscheidungen des Reiches Gottes" (S. 28). *Die* Kirche richtet Großes aus, deren Pastoren still und treu ihre Gemeindearbeit ausrichten, wenn auch die Tagespresse *davon* wenig Notiz nimmt.

In eine lutherische Pastoraltheologie gehört auch ein Kapitel über das allgemeine Priestertum der Christen. Wir stellen etliche darauf bezügliche Aussprüche zusammen. Gleich auf der ersten Seite steht: „Die innerste Not der lutherischen Kirche ist ihre Gemeindelosigkeit." Sehen wir zu, daß solche Zustände nicht bei uns aufkommen! Weiter: „Wer hat zuerst gesagt, daß das Pfarramt nicht über der Gemeinde, sondern in der Gemeinde steht? Wer hat zuerst die sogenannten Laien erinnert, daß auch von ihnen derselbe priesterliche Dienst gefordert ist wie vom Pfarrer? Wer hat die kurzschlüssige Gegenüberstellung von Amt und Gemeinde überwunden durch eine theologische Synthese, die mit der Hoheit des Predigtamtes auch die Verantwortung der Gemeinde und mit dem wiedergewonnenen Ernst evangelischen Hirtendienstes auch die

Ehre der Gemeinde gesteigert hat? Das war Martin Luther." (S. 37.) Der Prediger ist übel daran, „wenn keine Laien da sind, die an ihrem Teil mithelfen, dem Worte dieser Predigt den Boden zu bereiten, durch christlichen Erziehungsdienst, durch Übung der brüderlichen Liebe, auch durch Aufrichtung und Erhaltung einer irgendwie gearteten kirchlichen Zucht" (S. 34). Auf der andern Seite gilt aber auch dies: „Von Geburt her gehört zum lutherischen Amt diese herrliche Unabhängigkeit von allen Menschenmeinungen und Menschenwünschen, die dem Pfarrer bei der Ausrichtung seines Dienstes Fesseln anlegen wollen. . . . Je fester er in diesem Bekenntnis verwurzelt ist, desto sicherer ist er auch bewahrt vor der Versuchung, der Menschen Knecht zu werden." (S. 31.) Von dieser Sache redet Luther bekanntlich so: „Das Predigtamt ist nicht ein Hofdiener oder Bauernknecht." „Gottes Diener, der soll und muß jedermanns Huddel sein." (St. L. Ausg., V, 707; X, 1627.) Bekanntlich kann man sich durch solche Huddelei bei manchen Laien beliebt machen; ihren Respekt genießt man aber nicht.

Wir lesen auf Seite 9: „Die Kirche ruht bei Luther auf dem Predigtamt, weil ihr ‚Leben und Wesen ganz im Worte Gottes steht'. (W. A. 7, 721.)" Luther redet da von dem Predigtamt in abstracto. Dörne wendet es aber auf das Predigtamt in concreto an. Dadurch wird die Sache aber schief. Wie es auf S. 24 ausgedrückt wird, ist es richtig: „Der Dienst dieses Amtes ist jedenfalls der wichtigste unter allen Diensten, die in der Gemeinde geübt werden." — Zu der Aussage S. 15, daß nach der ursprünglichen lutherischen Ordnung „nur Ordinierte in das Amt der Kirche berufen werden können"; „die Ordination bezeugt ihm, daß er in der Lage ist, das Amt des Predigers zu verwalten — er ist vokationsfähig", vergleiche „Kirchliche Zeitschrift", 1927, Seite 211: „Die Voraussetzung ist dabei (in Luthers Ordinationsformular), daß der Ordinand von einer Gemeinde berufen ist und sein Examen bestanden hat. . . . Der letzte Grund wird doch gewesen sein die Erkenntnis, daß der Ordination die Berufung vorausgehen müsse." — S. 31: „Eine gesunde Lehre vom Amt setzt eine gesunde Lehre von der Kirche, vor allem eine Überwindung des üblichen Dualismus von ‚unsichtbarer' und ‚sichtbarer' Kirche voraus." Vertritt Dörne die Meinung von einer „unsichtbar-sichtbaren" Kirche? — „Das Sakrament ist Wort, und das Wort ist seinerseits selbst Sakrament." (S. 16.) Sollte man so reden?

Pastor Nebe, Lic. hab., Dr., erteilt in der Schrift **„Kämpfende Theologie"** denen eine Lektion, die „praktisches Christentum", „undogmatisches Christentum" gegen Theologie, Lehre ausspielen. Er sagt ihnen unter anderm: „Hier ist es auch nicht mehr möglich, irgendeinen schlichten, praktischen ‚Glauben' gegen Theologie auszuspielen. Hier steht nicht ‚Glaube' gegen Lehre, sondern Lehre gegen Lehre. . . . Darum ist auch das hallende Feldgeschrei ‚Ohne Dogma!' eine unrechte Losung. Denn ohne Wort, Begriff, Satz und Bekenntnis kommen ja

auch das ständig bemühte Leben und Erleben nicht aus. Das ‚Ohne Dogma!' ist in Wahrheit nur Chiffre für ‚Nicht dieses Dogma!' Das ‚andere Dogma' also, die ‚andere Theologie', ist auf dem Plan, wenn der scheinbar verbindende und ausgleichende Ruf ‚Ohne Dogma!' hörbar wird." (S. 7. 9.) „Auch gegenüber dem echten, ‚praktischen Christentum' ist zu sagen, daß es rechtes christliches Tun nur gibt unter Anrufung Gottes des Heiligen Geistes, daß demnach in jedem wirklich christlichen praktischen Christentum ein bestimmtes Bekennen der Lehre der Kirche, das heißt aber zugleich eine bestimmte Aussage der Theologie, vorenthalten ist." (S. 5.) Auch die bekommen ihre Lektion, die die „Lehre" als „Theologengezänk", „Haarspalterei" diffamieren. „Die Kirche JEsu Christi weiß um die Tatsache, daß der Versucher die Sprache Gottes spricht, daß sich die Verführung unter dem Namen Christi vollzieht und daß sich Satan in den Engel des Lichts verkleidet. Weil die Nicht-Wahrheit und die Gegen-Wahrheit unter dem Schein der Wahrheit erscheint, darum ist es auch das Amt der Theologie, Widerstand gegen die falschen Lehren zu leisten durch Zergliederung, Nachprüfung und enthüllende Entlarvung mehrdeutiger, schillernder Begriffe. . . . In der Theologie ist heute die Pflicht zur schärfsten Urteilsbildung gefordert." (S. 18 f.) Und wenn dann der treue Theolog die geheime Bosheit der falschen Lehre aufgedeckt hat — er muß dabei zu Zeiten haarspaltend vorangehen — und die Kinder Gottes davor warnt, so soll das „Theologengezänk" sein. Natürlich — „das kann der Wolf nicht leiden", wie das Motto von „Lehre und Wehre" erinnerte, „daß die Hunde feindlich bellen" (Luther; St. L. A., IX, 1101). — Martin Dörne hat gesagt, daß das lutherische Amtsverständnis keine Pfarrer kennt, die nicht auch Theologen wären. Nun läßt Nebe gar auch die Bauern zur Theologie zu: „Es ist jedoch wichtig zu sehen, daß in jeder christlichen Aussage, etwa in der eines Bauern, daß er lutherischer Christ sei, bereits ein theologisches Urteil enthalten ist, daß also im strengen Sinne jeder Christ zugleich auch Theologe ist." (S. 13.) Und nachdem der Unterschied zwischen dem Bauerntheologen und dem Berufstheologen dargelegt ist, heißt es weiter: „Es ist also töricht, den ‚Laien' gegen den Theologen auszuspielen." Da die Theologie ihrem eigentlichen Wesen nach nichts anders tut, als die Aussagen der Schrift zu wiederholen, und die Schrift ein so einfaches, klares Buch ist, so muß man darauf gefaßt sein, von dem gottesfürchtigen, in der Schrift lebenden Bauern treffliche theologische Urteile zu hören. Man vergleiche hier das Vorwort zu „Lehre und Wehre", 1888. Es gab ja bei uns in der guten alten Zeit auch „Laientheologen", die nicht nur die Bibel, sondern gar auch „Lehre und Wehre" lasen, und man hörte gerne auf sie. Und dies Geschlecht ist jedenfalls noch nicht ganz ausgestorben. — Unsere Schrift ist betitelt: „Kämpfende Theologen". Es heißt gleich auf der ersten Seite: „Es bleibt ein echtes Kennzeichen für die Echtheit der Theologie, wenn sie Ärgernis erregt."

Seite 9 steht der verwunderliche Satz: „Theologie ist Bekenntniswissenschaft.“ Die Bezeichnung „Wissenschaft“ wollen wir hier nicht weiter untersuchen. Aber man ist doch in der lutherischen Kirche gewohnt, die Theologie in erster Linie auf die Bibel zu gründen. Und auf dieser selben Seite steht: „Theologie ist im strengen Sinne nicht Tun oder Denken, sondern ist gebundenes Hören auf die Wahrheit Gottes“, und auf der nächsten: „Sie ist Theologie des Wortes Gottes, untersteht nicht dem Wort der Gemeinschaftsseele.“ Warum also den Eindruck erwecken, als habe die Theologie es in erster Linie mit dem Bekenntnis zu tun? — Ein gefährlicher Satz steht S. 22 geschrieben: „Unfehlbare Theologie sagen hieße, das Denken als nicht dem Bereich der Sünde unterworfen erklären.“ Man studiere hier den Abschnitt „Theologie und Gewißheit“ in Piepers „Christliche Dogmatik“ (I, S. 123 ff.).

In R. Hermanns **„Deutung und Umdeutung der Schrift“** begegnen wir einer vierfachen Schwärmerei. Da ist zuerst die Schwärmerei des Allegorisierens, die sich nicht nur bei den Alten, sondern auch bei Neueren findet („Es ist Allegorese, wenn der biblische Begriff ‚Volk Gottes‘ auf Deutschland übertragen wird“, S. 15). Dieser Schwärmerei gegenüber betont Hermann den selbstverständlichen Grundsatz, daß wie bei jeder Botschaft so auch bei der Botschaft Gottes, der Heiligen Schrift, allein „der Wortlaut“, „der Wortsinn“ gilt (S. 6. 10). Da ist ferner die römische Schwärmerei, die die Tradition neben die Schrift stellt, und „der Kirche Autorität in Sachen der Interpretation der Schrift“ zuschreibt. Auch protestantische und lutherische Kirchenleitungen sind, wie Hermann S. 10 andeutet, der Schwärmerei von der Autorität der Kirche verfallen. Demgegenüber betont er „die Alleingültigkeit von Gottes Selbstoffenbarung“. Ja auch die *Theologie* darf sich „nicht als Zwischeninstanz zwischen dem Worte Gottes und dem Menschen“ gebärden (S. 10). Ferner wird die Kirche auch heute noch von der alten Schwärmerei geplagt, die die Schrift als „toten Buchstaben“ ansieht. Sonderlich die dialektische Theologie huldigt dieser Schwärmerei. So sagt z. B. der dialektische Theolog W. Vischer: „Zeichen, Kennzeichen des im Stalle geborenen Gottessohnes sind für alle, die ihn suchen, die alttestamentlichen so gut wie die neutestamentlichen Schriften: Krippe und Windeln, nicht das Kind selbst; Zeugnisse *in toten Buchstaben*, nicht der lebendige Christus. *Der Heilige Geist muß die Buchstaben durchwehen, sonst bleiben sie tot.*“ (S. 20.) Demgegenüber betont Hermann, daß „im Worte selbst der Geist, der Geist Gottes, ist“ (S. 6). Und die vierte Schwärmerei, die sonderlich heutzutage die Kirche plagt, liegt in der Unterscheidung von Schrift und Gottes Wort. Und *dieser* schwärmerischen, verhängnisvollen Unterscheidung von Schrift und Gottes Wort tritt Hermann nicht entgegen, sondern macht sie mit. Ihm ist die Bibel nicht das inspirierte Gotteswort, sondern nur „die Urkunde der

Verkündigung des Evangeliums", „die Urkunde der kirchengründenden Verkündigung des Wortes Gottes" (S. 5. 9. 19. 22), und diese Urkunde, diese Schrift ist nicht völlig irrtumslos. „Bei der Wortverkündigung der Apostel, der Missionare, bei der heutigen Wortverkündigung mischt sich die menschliche Sünde ein. Sollte es bei den Verfassern der biblischen Bücher . . . anders stehen?" (S. 22.) „Der Auslegung des Alten Testaments, wie sie sich im Neuen findet, können wir nicht schlechthin folgen." (S. 31.) Die Bibel ist also nicht schlechthin Gottes Wort, sondern enthält nur Gottes Wort. Stehen die Sachen so, so hält die Berufung auf den Wortlaut, den Wortsinn nicht Stich. Denn welcher Wortsinn ist gemeint? Der Wortsinn der Schrift oder der Wortsinn des in der Schrift enthaltenen, mit dem Wort der Schrift nicht völlig identischen Wortes Gottes? Diese Schwärmerei läßt die Wahrheit nicht weniger in der Luft schweben als die Schwärmerei der Allegorese und die Schwärmerei „des toten Buchstabens". — Wir haben uns oben den Ausspruch von „der Alleingültigkeit von Gottes Selbstoffenbarung" angeeignet. Wir verstehen darunter die Alleingültigkeit der Heiligen Schrift. Soll darunter aber die Alleingültigkeit des Wortes Gottes im Gegensatz zur Schrift verstanden werden, so ist der Ausdruck Schwärmerei. — Was ist von dieser Aussage zu halten: „Die Theologie verkündigt nicht, wie die Predigt, direkt Gottes Wort. Wohl kann sie zu solcher Verkündigung werden, aber das kann auch die schlichteste Berufserfüllung oder auch außerhalb dieser irgendeine Tat oder ein Wort" (S. 10)? 1. Geht die Theologie anders als die Predigt mit „Gottes Wort" um, kommt sie zu ihren Ergebnissen auf einem andern Weg, als der Prediger dazu kommt, so ist es Pseudotheologie. 2. Wir haben es hier mit dem vagen Begriff „Wort Gottes" zu tun, mit dem die modernen Theologen operieren. Die schlichteste Berufserfüllung ist eine Verkündigung des „Wortes Gottes". Man könnte das ja gelten lassen. Wir können es aber nicht gelten lassen, wo es sich um die Bestimmung des Begriffs „Wort Gottes" in der Frage handelt, ob die Schrift Gottes Wort ist oder nur Gottes Wort enthält.

Was der Pastor in seiner Studierstube treibt und was er seiner Gemeinde auf Grund des Wortes Gottes in der Predigt und sonst sagt und diese sich sagen läßt, ist von großem Einfluß auf das Wohlergehen des Volkes und des Staates. Er braucht sich nicht in die Politik zu mischen, um seinen Einfluß geltend zu machen. Die Prediger, die Gottes Wort treiben, erweisen dem Staat den höchsten Dienst. Man lese die Schrift **„Das Heil des Volkes und das Evangelium"** (die „überarbeitung einer Antrittsvorlesung ist, die am 14. Oktober 1936 im Predigerseminar Lückendorf gehalten worden ist"). Sie legt dar auf Grund der aus Gottes Wort geschöpften Ausführungen Luthers, sonderlich in seiner Genesisvorlesung, daß, so wahr es ist, daß Gott manchmal einem Volk, dem er den geistlichen Segen entzieht, leiblichen Segen läßt (cf. W. A. 43, 247 f.), es ebenso wahr ist, daß das Volk, das das Evangelium ver-

wirft, damit rechnen muß — bei aller Freiheit Gottes —, daß es auch äußerlich zugrunde geht, und weiter, daß allein ein solcher Segen, mit dem Gott himmlischen Segen verbindet, wirklicher Segen ist, „während die Schätze der andern ‚opes sine benedictione', Schätze ohne Segen, sind (W. A. 43, 298 f.; 52, 150)". — Lau hat Luther nicht recht verstanden, wenn er ihn zum Patron des Landeskirchentums in der heutigen Gestalt der „Volkskirche" macht. Er schreibt S. 20: „Luther: ‚Terra, in qua sonat Verbum, est Dei terra, non Creatoris sed Gubernatoris suae ecclesiae, qui suos sanctos hoc modo gubernat, ut ingrediantur in regnum coelorum' (W. A. 43, 600 [St. L. A. II, 434]; frei übersetzt: ein Land, in dem Gottes Wort erschallt, ist Gottes Land, nicht in dem Sinne, daß er es geschaffen hat, sondern in dem, daß er darin seine Kirche leitet, er, der seine Heiligen gerade auf die Weise dahin leitet, daß sie in das Himmelreich hineinkommen). Jawohl, das Landeskirchentum gehört nicht nur in Luthers Kirchenpolitik, sondern auch in seine Theologie; ich denke dabei nicht an die verfassungsrechtliche Seite des Landeskirchentums (landesherrliches Summepiskopat), sondern an die Seite, die wir heute die volkskirchliche nennen würden." Und „Volkskirche" wird so definiert: „Sie ist Kirche als Ordnung im Ordnungengefüge eines Volkes (nicht: als Stück der Volksordnung!)." Man mache doch die Kirche ganz frei vom Staate! Auch die loseste Zusammenkoppelung beider ist für beide unheilvoll.

Wer ein tüchtiger Theolog werden und bleiben will, der studiere Luther. Er werde nicht unwillig, wenn ihm ein Buch in die Hand gegeben wird, das fast ausschließlich aus Lutherzitaten besteht. Ein solches köstliches Büchlein ist Beyers **„Luther und das Recht"**. Da belehrt uns Luther über den Unterschied zwischen Kirche und Staat (dabei auch über den Unterschied zwischen Gesetz und Evangelium), über das Naturgesetz, das Volksrecht, das Gesetz Mosis und den Dekalog, über das göttliche Recht der menschlichen Gesetzgebung, die rechte, christliche Handhabung der Staatsgesetze, die Pflicht der Obrigkeit usw. — alles Dinge, die der Christ als Staatsbürger, Privatmann oder Beamter, zu wissen hat. Und da kann uns Luther das Rechte sagen. Man verüble es Luther nicht, wenn er sagt, S. 21: „Wie wohl mich auch zuweilen dünkt, daß die Regiment und Juristen wohl auch eines Luthers bedürften." (Auslegung des 101. Psalm. W. A. 51, 258.) Der Reformator darf so reden. Gott wollte die Reformation der Kirche auch dem Staate zugute kommen lassen. Es würde besser im Staate stehen, wenn unsere Bürger Luthers Gesinnung dem Staate gegenüber teilten und betätigten. „Nach dem Evangelio oder geistlichem Amt ist auf Erden kein besser Kleinod, kein größer Schatz, kein reicher Almosen, kein schöner Stift, kein feiner Gut denn Oberkeit, die das Recht schaffet und hält." (Auslegung des 82. Psalms. W. A. 31, I, 201.) Unsere Bürger dürften sich auch Luthers Zurückhaltung zum Muster nehmen. Er hatte ja den Juristen manches zu sagen; sie „bedurften eines Luthers"; aber in

derſelben Verbindung kommt das Wort vor: „Darum ich mir nicht laſſe gefallen den Meiſter Klügling, ſo die weltlichen Rechte meiſtern, oder alle, die es beſſer machen wollen“. Und die Staatsbeamten und die, die ſich auf den Staatsdienſt vorbereiten (und jeder von uns in ſeinem Stande und Berufe), ſollen ſich ja Luthers Rat zu Herzen nehmen: „Mach es doch ſo: Morgens früh nach dem Aufſtehen lies einen Pſalm, ja betrachte etliche Sprüche aus der Schrift. Und dann ſprich mit gebeugten Knien ein Vaterunſer: ‚HErr, Vater unſeres HErrn JEſu Chriſti, du haſt es ſo beſtimmt, daß ich ein Juriſt ſein ſoll; nun gib auch Gnade dazu.‘ Er hat's gerne, wenn du ſo beteſt, und gern erhört er dich. Darnach fahre zu und fall in die Bücher und höre die Lehrer und ſtudiere getroſt und werde gelehrt.“ (Predigt vom 3. Februar 1544, W. A. 49, 340.) Wenn wir Raum hätten, ſo würden wir ſämtliche von Beyer benutzten Zitate weitergeben.

Man rede ſich nicht ein, daß, wenn Beyer und Lau und Dörne und andere ſo viel Gewicht auf die Lehrdarlegungen Luthers legen und wenn Elert z. B. betont, daß eine gewiſſe Ausſage „in Luthers Beiſein und unter ſeiner Billigung“ gemacht wurde, das ein Zeichen von einem in die lutheriſche Kirche eindringenden Traditionalismus iſt. Dieſe Männer ſind keine Traditionaliſten. Das Motto von *Theologia Militans* beginnt mit dem Satz: „‚Luthertum‘ als Deckname für beruhigtes Epigonendaſein im Schatten eines alten Erbes iſt gründlich mißverſtandenes Luthertum.“ Dabei berufen ſie ſich bei jeder Gelegenheit auf Luther und die Väter. Das tun auch wir. Das iſt nicht Traditionalismus. Das iſt die von Gott gebotene Treue im Gebrauch der von Gott der Kirche verliehenen Gaben. Man beſinne ſich zweimal und dreimal, ehe man das Urteil ausſpricht, es ſei böſer Traditionalismus, wenn man bei Lehrverhandlungen hört: So hat Luther geſagt, ſo hat Walther geſagt, ſo haben Stöckhardt und Pieper geſagt, ſo ſteht in alten Synodalberichten geſchrieben. Man werde nicht unwillig, wenn man bei uns gerne auf die Lehrdarlegungen der Väter eingeht. Sie haben die Sachen meiſt trefflich dargelegt. So gut werden wir es kaum machen können. Es ſteckt auch ein Stück Bekenntnis darin, daß man auch heute noch die Väter reden läßt. Läßt man Luther und die miſſouriſchen Lehrväter tüchtig mitreden, ſo iſt das ein gutes Schutzmittel gegen Traditionalismus. Der miſſouriſche Geiſt duldet es nicht, daß man dem sola Scriptura zuwiderhandelt. Gott gebe darum, daß die Weiſe nie bei uns abkomme, daß wir fleißig Luther und Walther und die alten Synodalberichte ſtudieren und zitieren. Dieſe Weiſe wird abkommen, wenn wir nicht mehr mit ihrer Lehre und Weiſe ſtimmen. Wir wollen aber bei ihrer Lehre bleiben, eben weil wir erkannt haben, daß dies die Lehre der Heiligen Schrift iſt. In Summa, Luther hat geſagt: *Sola Scriptura!* Und Luther hat geſagt: „Höre die Lehrer und ſtudiere getroſt und werde gelehrt.“

Th. Engelder

The Doctrine of Justification According to Bernard of Clairvaux

Bernard of Clairvaux (1090—1153) was the most influential man of his day. He was the counselor and adviser of Popes, princes, and the common man; he was an eloquent preacher (his sermons are strikingly Scriptural and remarkably free from quotations from the Church Fathers); he was the composer of beautiful hymns (the best-known hymns of his school are "O Bleeding Head and Wounded," "Jesus, the Very Thought of Thee," and "O Jesus, King Most Wonderful"); but above all he was a sincerely pious and truly humble Christian. Luther has well said: "If there ever lived a God-fearing and holy monk, it was Bernard of Clairvaux." It is true, Bernard championed the Papacy as the highest authority in the Church, exalted monasticism as the highest ideal of Christianity, and often wandered into an enthusiastic mysticism; and yet, he, as few others of his time, gloried in the crucified Christ. "This is my philosophy, and it is the loftiest in the world—to know Jesus, and Him crucified." [1] In another sermon we read: "Dry and tasteless is every kind of spiritual food if this sweet oil be not poured into it; and insipid, if it be not seasoned with this salt. A book or writing has no single point of goodness for me if I do not read therein the name of Jesus, nor has a conference any interest for me unless the name of Jesus be heard in it. As honey to the mouth, as melody in the ear, as a song of gladness to the heart, is the name of Jesus." [2] Therefore Luther said: "When Bernard is speaking of Christ, it is a great pleasure to listen to him; but when he leaves that subject and discourses on rules and works, it is no longer St. Bernard."

In the sermons which he preached almost daily to his monks at Clairvaux, Bernard often sang the praises of monastic life. He warned the novice against returning to the worldly life. "Such a person yields himself to the last degree of shamefulness; he makes that leap which is rashness itself, that fall, most disgraceful, shameful, and full of confusion and ignominy, from the sky into the abyss, from the pavement of a palace into a dunghill, from a throne into the gutter, from heaven into a swamp of mire, from the cloister into the outer world, yes, from paradise into hell." [3]

Towards the end of his life Bernard traveled through France and Germany in order to arouse the people to take part in the Second Crusade. He addressed a letter to the German nation, and with fiery language he appealed to the Christians to take up arms

1) In *Cant.*, serm. XLIII, 4.
2) *Op. cit.*, serm. XV, 6.
3) *Op. cit.*, serm. LXIII, 6.

in order to wrest the Holy City from the Turks. In this appeal we read: "God would be your debtor and give to His servants their reward, the forgiveness of sins and eternal life. . . . Accept the sign of the cross, and you will receive the forgiveness of all those sins which you have confessed with a contrite heart. The cloth of which it is made costs but little, but if worn on pious shoulders, it is worthy of the kingdom of God." 4)

Bernard still labored under the Catholic idea of merit. Man must make himself worthy of the merits of Christ and must add to these merits. "Even infants, when regenerated in Baptism, are not wholly wanting in merits, but have the merits of Christ, of which nevertheless they render themselves unworthy if not through inability but through neglect they join to them no merits of their own; and this is indeed the peril of those who have reached the age of discretion. Make it, then, your care to have merits; but, having them, know that they have been given to you; hope for the fruit of them from the mercy of God, and you will escape the danger whether of poverty, of ingratitude, or of presumption. A total want of merits is injurious poverty, but a mistaken belief in one's wealth of merits is spiritual presumption." 5) As a good Roman Catholic, Bernard recommends fasting as a means of averting eternal punishment. "It not only obtains forgiveness, but also earns grace; it does not only blot out sin which we have committed, but also repels future sins, which we could commit." 6) Bernard also speaks of humility as a merit. "Unwise and insane is he who relies on other merits of life, whoever trusts in another religion or wisdom except that of humility." 7) But when he thus speaks of merit, it is not the real St. Bernard that is speaking.

The real Bernard says that man should in no wise trust in his own merits or righteousness. "I believe that the Spirit testifies of these three things: Above all, that it is necessary to believe that you can have forgiveness of sins only by His pardon; secondly, that you cannot at all do a good work except also this be given by Him; finally, that you cannot earn eternal life by any work, but that also this is given to you by grace." 8) "Even the saints need to entreat pardon for their sins that they may be saved by the mercy of God and must not trust in their own righteousness; for all have sinned, and all need mercy." 9)

Man must humbly confess his sins and trust in the mercy of God. "Be not afraid if you cannot reach that perfection which you are desiring; but what your imperfect conduct is lacking a humble confession may supply, and the eyes of God will graciously look

---

4) *Ep.*, 363.
5) In *Cant.*, serm. LXVIII, 6.
6) In *Quad.*, serm. IV.
7) *De Div.*, serm. XXVI, 1.
8) In *Fest. Annun. Mar.*, serm. I, 1.
9) In *Cant.*, serm. LXXIII, 4.

upon your imperfections. Because for this purpose He has severely ordered His commands, that we, when we see that our perfection is coming short and cannot fulfil what is due, we might seek refuge in His mercy; and since we cannot appear in a dress of innocence or righteousness, we may appear clothed in confession. For confession is a beauty in the eyes of the Lord; only that it be not merely of the mouth but also of the whole man, so that all our bones may say, 'Lord, who is like unto Thee?' and that one may look at the throne of peace with the desire to be reconciled to God." [10] Man ought sincerely to repent of his sins, but he must not despair. "Sorrow for sin is indeed necessary, but it ought not to be continual; and there should be mingled with it the more joyful remembrance of the divine goodness lest the heart be burdened because of the sorrow it feels and despair bring about the actual loss of it." [11] Confession should therefore be made "in faith, that is to say, it must be filled with hope, free from distrust of obtaining pardon for our offenses, or from fear, lest by making it, you should be rather condemning than justifying yourself. Judas, who betrayed our Lord, and Cain, who slew his brother, confessed their crime, but each despaired of God's mercy." [12] The Christian has nothing to fear at the coming of Christ. "What must I do when I hear that the Lord is coming? Must I flee like Adam? Must I not despair, hearing that He comes whose Law I have so greatly transgressed, whose patience I have abused, for whose blessing I have been found so ungrateful? But what greater consolation could there be than that in the sweet Word, in the comforting name! Therefore also He Himself says that the Son is not come to judge the world, but that the world by Him might be saved. Now I come near confidently; now I pray full of confidence. For what should I fear if the Savior enters my house? Against Him alone have I sinned; it will be forgiven, whatever He forgives. It is God who justifies; who is it that may condemn? Or who will accuse God's elect? Therefore we ought to rejoice that He will come to us; for now He will be inclined to pardon.[13]

Since the days of Augustine it was universally taught that man is justified by being made righteous. Grace is infused into the heart of the sinner, and thereby his free will is drawn to God in faith and drawn away from sin. When this is consummated, man has the forgiveness of sins and is thus completely justified. Now, after all these centuries Bernard was the first who clearly taught that man is justified, *i. e.*, declared righteous, by faith alone.

In his *Tract against Abaelard,* Bernard writes: "What could

---

10) In *Vig. Nat. Dom.*, serm. II, 4.
11) In *Cant.*, serm. XI, 2.
12) In *Cant.*, serm. XVI, 12.
13) In *Eph. Dom.*, serm. I, 1.

man, the slave of sin, fast bound by the devil, do of himself to recover that righteousness which he had formerly lost? Therefore he who lacked righteousness had Another's imputed to him. . . . It was man who owed the debt; it was Man who paid it. For if One, says Paul, died for all, then were all dead, so that, as One bore the sins of all, the satisfaction of One is imputed to all." [14] Bernard continues: "Faithful is the saying and worthy of all acceptation that, while we were yet sinners, we were reconciled to God by the death of His Son. Where there is reconciliation, there is also remission of sins. For if, as the Scripture says, our sins separate between us and God, there is no reconciliation while sin remains. In what, then, is remission of sins? This cup, He says, is the New Testament in My blood, which shall be shed for you for the remission of sins. Therefore, where there is reconciliation, there is remission of sins. And what is that but justification? Whether therefore we call it reconciliation, or remission of sins, or justification, or again redemption, or liberation from the chains of the devil, by whom we were taken captive at his will, at all events by the death of the Only-begotten we obtain that we have been justified freely by His blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of His grace." [15] Again we read in one of his sermons: "Oh, truly blessed and indeed the only blessed one is he unto whom the Lord will not impute iniquity. For there is none without sin, no, not one; for all have sinned and come short of the glory of God. But who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? It is sufficient for all righteousness to me to have Him upon my side against whom alone I have offended. Everything which He decreed not to impute unto me is as though it had not been. Not to sin is the righteousness of God, but the forgiveness of God is the righteousness of man." [16] Here Bernard clearly teaches an objective justification, though, sorry to say, he, as an Augustinian, denied universal grace.

Bernard also taught that the subjective justification was by faith alone. "The great fragrance of Thy righteousness is spread abroad upon every side, inasmuch as Thou art not only righteous, but also Righteousness itself, — yes, a Righteousness which renders righteous him who is unrighteous. And as powerful as Thou art to justify, so bountiful art Thou also to forgive. Wherefore let whosoever is touched with sincere sorrow for his sins, who hungers and thirsts after righteousness, believe without hesitation in Thee, who justifies the ungodly; and being justified by faith alone, he shall have peace with God." [17]

---

14) *Tract. de Err. Abael.*, VI, 15.
15) *Ibid.*, VIII, 20.
16) In *Cant.*, serm. XXIII, 15.
17) In *Cant.*, serm. XXII, 8.

Bernard could well have sung "Rock of Ages, cleft for me"; for in a similar vein he says: "Another writer has thus expounded this passage (Cant. 2, 14), interpreting the clefts of the rocks as the wounds of Christ. And rightly so, for that rock was Christ. Precious are those clefts to us; for they establish the faith of the resurrection and the divinity of Christ. My Lord and my God, said the apostle. Whence came that assured conviction if not from the clefts of the Rock? In these the sparrow has found a house and the turtle a nest for herself where she may lay her young; in these the dove finds safety and regards without fear the hawk that flies around. . . . And where, in truth, is there a firm and safe refuge for us who are weak except in the wounds of our Savior? There I dwell with safety so much the greater as He is so powerful to save. The world rages around me, the body weighs upon me, the devil lays snares for me; but I do not fall, for I am founded upon a firm Rock. Perhaps I have committed some great sin, my conscience is troubled; but I do not despair because I remember the wounds of my Lord; for He was wounded for our iniquities. What sin is there so deadly that it may not be remitted through the death of Christ? If, then, I keep in remembrance a remedy so powerful and efficacious, I cannot be terrified by any disease, however virulent it be." [18] Christ's merits are imputed to the sinner. "The pitying mercy of the Lord is, then, all my merit. I am not altogether destitute of merits as long as He deigns to have compassion upon me; and they will be increased just in proportion to the greatness of His mercy. What if I feel myself guilty of many offenses? Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound. And if the mercy of the Lord is from everlasting to everlasting, I also will sing of the mercies of the Lord forever. Shall it be my own righteousness that I celebrate? Nay, of the Lord. I will make mention of Thy righteousness, even of Thine only. For that is mine also, since Thou Thyself hast become my Righteousness. . . . Thy righteousness is eternal and so ample as amply to cover me equally with Thyself. In me it shall cover a multitude of sins; but in Thee, O Lord, what does it cover but the treasures of Thy lovingkindness, the riches of Thy goodness to us? These are the treasures which are laid up for me in the clefts of the Rock." [19]

Saving faith must be a personal faith. "If thou believest that thy sins cannot be abolished except by Him, against whom alone thou hast sinned and upon whom sin cannot fall, thou doest well; but add to it also that thou shalt believe this, that thy sins have been forgiven to thee through Him. This is the testimony which

18) In *Cant.*, serm. LXI, 3.
19) In *Cant.*, serm. LXI, 5.

the Holy Spirit utters in thy heart, saying: Thy sins are forgiven thee." [20]

Justification is to be followed by sanctification. "We may call faith the root of the vine; the various virtues, the branches; good works, the bunch, or cluster, of grapes which it bears; and devotion, the wine they yield. For as there can be no branch without the root, so without faith there is no virtue." [21] Such faith shows itself by works. "As long as faith lives in us, Christ lives in us. When faith dies, there is, as it were, a dead Christ in the soul. As we discern the life of the body in its movements, so the life of faith is shown by good works. As the soul is the life of the body, so love is the life of faith; and as the body dies when the soul leaves it, so faith expires when love grows cold." [22]

Bernard of Clairvaux at times reached truly evangelical heights, and his sermons clearly show that even in the darkest days of Popery there were still seven thousand who did not worship Baal. How different is his theology from that of the great Thomas Aquinas, the "Prince of Scholastics," who lived a century later. In Aquinas all emphasis is placed on what man must do in order to merit eternal life; in Bernard it is to know Christ, and Him crucified. Man must humbly confess his sin and trust solely in the mercy of God in Christ Jesus. Surely there can be no doubt that Bernard of Clairvaux was, on the whole, an evangelical Christian.

Morrison, Ill. THEO. DIERKS

Das Verhältnis der Schmalkaldiſchen Artikel zur Augsburgiſchen Konfeſſion

Als im Februar 1537 der Konvent von Schmalkalden zuſammentrat, ſah er ſich vor die Aufgabe geſtellt, den Römlingen gegenüber ein neues Glaubensbekenntnis aufzuſtellen. In Betracht kommen konnten nur die Sätze Luthers, die er für den Konvent geſchrieben hatte. Dieſe Artikel gefielen ja dem Kurfürſten Johann Friedrich ſo ſehr, daß er unter allen Umſtänden ihre Annahme ſeitens des Konvents wünſchte. Aber es kam nicht dazu. Urſache war Melanchthons ablehnende Haltung. Luther hatte ſeinen Sätzen die Schlußworte hinzugefügt: „Dies ſind die Artikel, darauf ich ſtehen muß und ſtehen will bis in meinen Tod, ob Gott will, und weiß darinne nichts zu ändern noch nachzugeben; will aber jemand etwas nachgeben, der tue es auf ſein Gewiſſen." Damit war auch das gemeint, was er über den Papſt geſchrieben hatte. Melanchthon aber ſtand anders. Er unterſchrieb die Sätze Luthers mit

20) In *Annun. Mar.*, serm. I.
21) In *Cant.*, serm. XXX, 6.
22) In *Temp. Res.*, serm. II.

dem Vorbehalt: „Vom Papst aber halte ich, so er das Evangelium wollte zulassen, daß ihm um Friedens und gemeiner Einigkeit willen . . . seine Superiorität über die Bischöfe, die er sonst hat, iure humano auch von uns zuzulassen sei." Was Luther zu dieser abweichenden Stellung Melanchthons sagte, darüber verlautet nichts. Der Kurfürst aber war sehr ungehalten darüber, wie er das auch in dem Brief, den er am 7. Januar 1537 an Luther richtete, zum Ausdruck brachte. Trotzdem nahm er Melanchthon nach Schmalkalden mit in der Hoffnung, daß Luthers Anwesenheit ihn abhalten würde, mit seiner Meinung hervorzutreten. Melanchthon aber war gesonnen, nicht zurückzuhalten, ja seine Absicht war, die Annahme der Lutherschen Sätze mit allen ihm zu Gebote stehenden Mitteln zu hintertreiben. Aber in Schmalkalden angekommen, mußte er sofort zu seinem Ärger und Leidwesen erfahren, daß er alleine stand mit seiner Stellung bezüglich des Papstes. Nicht ein Fürst, nicht ein Theolog stimmte ihm bei; der ganze Konvent war so durchaus antipapistisch eingestellt, daß an ein Nachgeben dem Papsttum gegenüber nicht zu denken war. Melanchthon wagte infolgedessen auch nicht, mit seiner Stellung vor den Konvent zu treten. Auch dem Landgrafen von Hessen gegenüber, den er für eine Art Bundesgenossen hielt, schwieg er stille, da der Konvent sich nie und nimmer zu seiner Stellung bekennen würde. Mit einer andern Sache jedoch hatte er etwas mehr Glück, wenigstens vorläufig; denn schließlich bedeutete Schmalkalden für ihn eine vollständige Niederlage. Als nämlich der Kanzler Brück in der ersten Sitzung am 10. Februar die Lehrpunkte namhaft machte, über die auf dem Konvent verhandelt werden sollte, womit er ganz klar und unmißverständlich auf die an Luther geschriebenen Artikel abzielte, da nutzte sofort Melanchthon die Sachlage aus. Es war ihm nämlich alles daran gelegen, daß die Vereinbarung mit den süddeutschen, zur reformierten Lehre hinneigenden Städten, die im Jahre vorher in Wittenberg zustande gekommen war, die sogenannte Wittenberger Konkordie, nicht wieder gestört würde. Nun hatte man sich da bezüglich des Abendmahls auf die Formel geeinigt, daß der Leib und das Blut des HErrn mit dem Brot und Wein gegeben werde. Luther aber hatte in seinen Sätzen geschrieben, daß Brot und Wein sei der Leib und das Blut des HErrn, und das tat er mit vollem Recht; denn wenn es sich in Wittenberg um ein vorläufiges Übereinkommen handelte, so handelte es sich jetzt um ein Bekenntnis den reformierten Gegnern gegenüber. Wenn nun auch Melanchthon an dieser Fassung nichts auszusetzen hatte, so fürchtete er doch, die Süddeutschen würden sie nicht annehmen, und dann wäre die Einigkeit des Konvents in Frage gestellt. Er steckte sich daher hinter den Landgrafen von Hessen, und seinem Drängen nachgebend, verhandelte dieser mit den Vertretern der Städte Ulm und Augsburg und gewann sie für Melanchthons Ansicht, daß man von Luthers Sätzen ganz absehen solle. In der zweiten Sitzung, am 11. Februar, erklärten daher die Vertreter dieser Städte, denen sich noch einige andere angeschlossen

hatten, daß sie sich nur an die Augustana und die Wittenberger Konkordie halten würden. Ein neues Bekenntnis sei nicht nötig, und sie würden keine neuen Artikel unterschreiben. Was konnten nun die Stände, die Feuer und Flamme für Luthers Artikel waren, anders tun, als sich ins Unvermeidliche zu fügen? Luthers Sätze wurden demzufolge beiseitegelegt und wurden von den Ständen nicht angenommen. Die Fürsten beschlossen, sich einfach auf die Augsburgische Konfession zu berufen, die ja von der ganzen lutherischen Kirche angenommen worden sei und zu der auch sie sich bekennen wollten. Sie gaben daher den anwesenden Theologen die Weisung, die Augsburgische Konfession noch einmal zu beraten und sie durch Herbeiziehung von mehr Bibelsprüchen und Beweisen aus den Vätern zu erweitern und zu bekräftigen und ganz besonders noch einen Artikel über die Macht und Oberherrlichkeit des Papstes hinzuzufügen, was dem Kaiser zu Gefallen in Augsburg unterlassen worden sei. Die Theologen machten sich nun daran, das Augsburger Bekenntnis zu besprechen, sahen aber von der von den Fürsten gewünschten Erweiterung ab, da man die nötigen Bücher nicht zur Hand hatte.

Als man alle Geschäfte erledigt hatte, schlug Bugenhagen vor, die Anwesenden möchten ihre volle Übereinstimmung mit Luthers Sätzen, die mittlerweile privatim die Runde gemacht hatten und von allen gelesen worden waren, durch ihre Namensunterschriften bezeugen. Der Vorschlag wurde angenommen, und Luthers Artikel wurden von den noch übrigen Theologen unterschrieben; denn einige, Luthers Kollegen Melanchthon, Bugenhagen, Justus Jonas, Cruciger, Amsdorf, Agricola und Spalatin, hatten schon in Wittenberg und einige andere sie unterwegs mit ihrer Namensunterschrift versehen. Im ganzen waren es ihrer dreiundvierzig, die ihre volle Übereinstimmung mit Luthers Sätzen erklärten, ohne freilich zu ahnen, daß ihre Unterschrift diese Sätze Luthers zu einer der Bekenntnisschriften der lutherischen Kirche stempeln würde. Schon vorher, als man noch über die Augsburgische Konfession beriet, schrieb Melanchthon seinen Traktat über die „Macht und Oberheit des Papstes". Er hatte allerdings den schweren Verdacht auf sich geladen, daß er auch in diesem Punkte mit dem Konvent nicht stimme, und von diesem Verdacht mußte er sich reinigen. Und der Kurfürst meinte es gut mit ihm und trug ihm, dem allerfähigsten Kopf in der ganzen Versammlung, im Namen der Theologen auf, den Traktat zu schreiben. Und siehe da, ganz unter dem Einfluß der durchaus antipäpstlichen Stimmung des Konvents stehend, erwähnt er nicht mit einer Silbe das menschliche Recht des Papstes, sondern verurteilt ihn ebenso scharf, wie Luther es getan hatte. In ganz vortrefflicher Weise entledigte er sich seiner Aufgabe. Dieser Traktat steht mit Luthers Sätzen in keinem Zusammenhang, wurde aber doch von dreiunddreißig Theologen unterschrieben und später als Anhang zu Luthers Sätzen mit in die Bekenntnisschriften der lutherischen Kirche aufgenommen. Daß nur drei-

unddreißig ihn unterschrieben, kam daher, daß eine Anzahl schon abgereist war und einige erklärten, daß sie nicht dazu autorisiert seien.

Wir haben diese historischen Tatsachen vorausgeschickt, nicht nur, weil sie einen vielleicht willkommenen Einblick in die Verhandlungen zu Schmalkalden gewähren, sondern auch vor allen Dingen deswegen, weil sie zum besseren Verständnis unsers Themas etwas beitragen. Die Frage erhebt sich nämlich jetzt: Warum haben die Theologen Luthers Sätze so freudig unterschrieben, wo doch die Augsburgische Konfession das eigentliche Bekenntnis der Kirche war? Wohl mag Melanchthons Gegnerschaft etwas damit zu tun gehabt haben, aber die Hauptursache war doch eine andere. Eben hatten sich die Theologen mit der Augsburgischen Konfession beschäftigt und sich aufs neue von ihrer unumstößlichen göttlichen Wahrheit überzeugt, und nun fanden sie in Luthers Sätzen alles in ihr Enthaltene bestätigt. Sie wollten also durch Unterzeichnung der Sätze Luthers sich noch einmal zur Augsburgischen Konfession bekennen. Klar und deutlich hatten die Lutheraner vor sechseinhalb Jahren ihre Stellung dem Papsttum gegenüber kundgetan, und genau dieselbe Stellung nahm Luther ein. Klar und deutlich hatten sie auf Grund des unfehlbaren Wortes Gottes die Lehren der lutherischen Kirche dargelegt, und dasselbe tat auch Luther. In keinem Stück wich Luther, der von der Wahrheit der Augsburgischen Konfession aufs tiefste überzeugt war, von ihr ab. Wenn in Luthers Artikeln nur im geringsten eine andere Lehrmeinung zutage getreten wäre, so wären sie gewiß von den Theologen verworfen worden. Es dürfte sich daher gewiß lohnen, auf das Verhältnis zwischen Luthers Sätzen und der Augsburgischen Konfession näher einzugehen.

Zunächst muß festgestellt werden, daß Luther nicht alle in der Augustana berührten Lehren namhaft macht. Luthers Artikel unterscheiden sich also von der Augustana, indem sie verschiedenes bringen, was in der Augustana nicht enthalten ist, und verschiedenes weglassen, was diese, zuweilen in breiter Ausführung, bringt. So hat Luther im zweiten Teil seiner Arbeit — denn vom ersten sehen wir ab — einen Passus über den Papst, von dem in der Augustana nichts gesagt ist, da man den Kaiser nicht vor den Kopf stoßen wollte. Wohl hatte man in lutherischen Kreisen damals schon eine klare Einsicht in das Wesen des Papsttums; man schwieg aber, damit der irenische Charakter des Bekenntnisses nicht gestört würde, und irenisch, friedlich, ist die Augsburgische Konfession. Sorgfältig hütete man sich, der katholischen Kirche gegenüber harte Worte zu gebrauchen, und nur die außerhalb der katholischen und lutherischen Kirche stehenden Irrlehrer werden hie und da „verdammt". Daher auch nichts über den Papst, den man hätte hart angreifen müssen. Aber als Luther seine Sätze schrieb, brauchte er auf den Kaiser keine Rücksicht zu nehmen, und mit schwerem Geschütz geht er gegen den Papst vor, ja so derb, daß, als der kaiserliche Bevollmächtigte auf dem Konvent eine nähere Erklärung in diesem Stück ver-

langte, man sich nicht getraute, Luthers Ausführungen mit ihren harten Ausdrücken dem Kaiser vorzulegen, sondern Melanchthon beauftragte, die Sache weiter auszuführen, obwohl er es auch an scharfen Ausdrücken nicht fehlen ließ. — Sodann bringt Luther in besonderen Artikeln das Gesetz, das Evangelium, die Schlüssel, den Bann, die Weihe und Vokation und die Menschensatzungen. Dafür hat die Augsburgische Konfession besondere Artikel über das Predigtamt, den neuen Gehorsam, die Kirche, nämlich daß einheitliche Zeremonien nicht zum Wesen der Kirche gehörten und daß die Sakramente ihre Gültigkeit hätten, wenn auch die Priester nicht fromm wären; ferner über den Gebrauch der Sakramente, das Kirchenregiment, die Kirchenordnungen, über Polizei und weltliches Regiment, über die Wiederkunft Christi, den freien Willen, die Ursache der Sünde, den Glauben und gute Werke, den Dienst der Heiligen, über beiderlei Gestalt im Sakrament, über den Unterschied der Speisen und über der Bischöfe Gewalt, worüber sich auch Melanchthon ausgesprochen hat. Beide, die Augsburgische Konfession und die Sätze Luthers, kommen überein in der Lehre von Gott, von der Messe, von der Sünde (Erbsünde), von der Buße, von der Taufe, von dem Sakrament des Altars, von der Beichte, von der Priesterehe, von der Kirche, nämlich daß sie sei die Gemeinde der Gläubigen, von der Rechtfertigung und von den Klostergelübden.

Daß Luther nicht die übrigen Artikel der Augustana behandelte, kam einfach daher, daß ihm nur daran gelegen war, die Hauptpunkte in der Lehre hervorzuheben, von denen man unter keinen Umständen etwas ablassen dürfe. Er wollte nicht, daß die Kirchenversammlung sich mit unbestrittenen Sachen beschäftigte. Deshalb hat er gleich zu Anfang des zweiten Teils seiner Sätze die Lehre von der Rechtfertigung gesetzt und damit den 4., 6. und 20. Artikel der Augsburgischen Konfession aufs deutlichste bestätigt. Was hier weitläufig dargelegt wird, faßt Luther kurz und treffend zusammen, nämlich daß wir nur in dem Blute JEsu Christi Vergebung der Sünden haben und daß nur der Glaube gerecht macht; und genau dieselbe Lehre wie in der Augustana findet sich auch in seinen Sätzen. — Im 2. Artikel, der von der Messe handelt, geht Luther gegen diese viel schärfer vor als die Augustana. Er nennt sie den größten, schrecklichsten Greuel, nennt sie einen Drachenschwanz, der „viel Ungeziefer und Geschmeiß, mancherlei Abgötterei gezeugt" habe, Ausdrücke, vor denen sich die Augustana gehütet hat. Und doch stimmen Luthers Sätze genau mit dieser überein. Die Messe sei, sagt Luther, von Gott nicht geboten, sondern eitel Menschenwerk, sei eine greuliche Verderbung des Sakraments des Altars und streite gegen den Hauptartikel der christlichen Lehre, daß Christus mit einem Opfer für die Sünden der ganzen Welt genuggetan, in-

dem man sie zu einem immer zu wiederholenden Opfer zur Vergebung der Sünden gemacht habe usw.; und genau dasselbe lehrt der 13., 21. und 24. Artikel der Augustana. Was aber die Augustana nicht hat, sind die greulichen Folgen der Messe, die Luther aufzählt: das Fegfeuer, die dämonischen Erscheinungen, da man betrügerischerweise sagte, daß böse Geister als Menschenseelen erschienen seien, die mancherlei Messen und Vigilien, die Wallfahrten, die Brüderschaften, die nur im Interesse der Messe und der Werkgerechtigkeit gebildet seien, ferner den Reliquiendienst, den Ablaß und die Heiligenanrufung — alles Dinge, die durchweg zu verdammen seien. Statt der Messe solle man das heilige Abendmahl gebrauchen, rein und gewiß. — Im 3. Artikel, der von Stiften und Klöstern handelt, urteilt Luther über diese ungefähr geradeso wie im 14. Artikel des dritten Teils, wo er von Klostergelübden redet, nämlich daß es ein lästerlicher Gottesdienst sei, da man sage, daß das von Menschen erdachte Klosterleben etwas Besseres sei als der gemeine Christenstand. Er bestätigt damit den 27. Artikel der Augsburgischen Konfession, von dem nachher weiter die Rede sein wird. — Der 4. Artikel handelt vom Papst. Wir haben schon auf diesen Artikel hingewiesen und können uns damit begnügen, daß Luther den Papst, der sich alle Gewalt angemaßt habe, der den Hauptartikel christlicher Lehre, den Artikel von der Rechtfertigung, umgestoßen habe und die Seligkeit der Menschen an seine Person binde, als den rechten Antichristen bezeichnet, der sich über und wider Christum gesetzt und erhöht habe, weil er die Christen nicht wolle lassen selig sein ohne seine Gewalt, die doch nichts sei, von Gott nicht geordnet noch geboten.

Im dritten Teil seiner Arbeit behandelt Luther die weiteren Lehren des Heilswegs und stellt sie in ihrem inneren Zusammenhang dar. Im 1. Artikel, von der Erbsünde, stimmt er genau mit dem 2. Artikel der Augustana überein, weist aber den pelagianischen Irrtum ab, dem auch die römischen Schultheologen huldigten, daß nach Adams Fall des Menschen natürliche Kräfte unverderbt geblieben seien; daß der Mensch einen freien Willen habe, das Gute zu tun und das Böse zu lassen; daß der Mensch aus natürlichen Kräften alle Gebote Gottes tun und halten könne; daß, wenn der Mensch tue, was er könne, Gott ihm gewißlich seine Gnade gebe. Das waren lauter heidnische Lehren, die „wir nicht leiden können". — Betreffs des 2. Artikels, der vom Gesetz handelt und worin Luther kurz angibt, wozu uns das Gesetz gegeben ist, schweigt die Augustana. — Von der Buße, dem 3. Artikel in Luthers Schrift, lehrt der 12. Artikel der Augustana ganz kurz, daß die rechte, wahre Buße sei „eigentlich Reue und Leid haben über die Sünde und doch daneben glauben an Evangelium und Absolution, daß die Sünde vergeben und durch Christum Gnade erworben sei, welcher Glaube das Herz tröstet und zufrieden macht". Dann werden noch verworfen, die da lehren, daß diejenigen, die einst fromm waren, nicht wieder fallen könnten, und daß man nicht durch den Glauben Vergebung der Sünden

erlange, ſondern durch eigenes Genugtun. Luther hingegen, dem doch alles auf die wahre Buße ankommt, ergeht ſich in weitläufiger Darſtellung darüber und geht mit den Römlingen ganz fürchterlich ins Gericht. Nachdem er zu Anfang, genau wie die Auguſtana, gezeigt hat, was wahre Buße ſei, wendet er ſich mit wuchtigen Worten gegen die falſche Lehre der Papiſten. Da dieſe von der Erbſünde falſch lehrten, indem ſie ſagten, die natürlichen Kräfte des Menſchen ſeien ganz und unverderbt, ſo erklärten ſie, daß man nur für die wirklichen Sünden Buße zu tun habe. Und für dieſe Buße hätten ſie geſetzt die Reue, die Beichte und die Genugtuung; wenn ſich dieſe drei Stücke bei einem Sünder fänden, ſo hätte er damit Vergebung verdient. Über die Reue lehrten ſie, daß, weil niemand wiſſe, wie groß die Reue ſein müſſe, man wenigſtens ſtatt der contritio die attritio haben müſſe, das heißt, daß man mit der Reue den Anfang machen müſſe; und wenn einer meinte, er könne keine rechte Reue empfinden, ſo ſagten ſie, ob er nicht wünſche, rechte Reue zu haben; und wenn er ja ſagte, ſo hatten ſie es für rechte Reue genommen und ihm auf ſolch gut Werk die Sünde vergeben. Ferner, aus der Buße, ſagt Luther, hätten ſie eine Marter gemacht, da ſie verlangten, daß man alle ſeine Sünden beichte, und da niemand habe wiſſen können, wann er genug gebeichtet habe, ſo ſei des Beichtens kein Ende geweſen. Betreffs der Genugtuung ſagt Luther, daß ſie eitel Jammer und Not mit ſich gebracht habe, da niemand habe wiſſen können, ob er für ſeine Sünden genuggetan habe. So ſei der ſcheußliche Ablaß entſtanden, da man für Geld ſeine Sünden loszuwerden vermeinte. So ſeien auch die Vigilien und Meſſen entſtanden, um den Sünder eher aus dem Fegfeuer zu befreien. So ſei auch die Lehre von den überflüſſigen guten Werken der Heiligen entſtanden, die denen zugute kämen, die ihrer mangelten. Und bei alledem ſei des HErrn Chriſti und des Glaubens nicht gedacht worden. Mit klaren Schriftſtellen weiſt Luther nach, daß dieſe papiſtiſchen Lehren von der Buße, die ſich auf eitel Menſchenwerke gründeten, eine ſchändliche, läſterliche Verdrehung der bibliſchen Lehre von der Buße ſeien. Wer wirklich Buße tue, der bereue alle ſeine Sünden, ob ſie erkannt oder unerkannt ſeien; der brauche auch keine Genugtuung; denn Chriſtus habe durch ſein Leiden und Sterben für alle ſeine Sünden genuggetan. Mit dieſer Lehre von der Buße, ſagt Luther, „ſtoßen wir Papſt und alles, was auf unſer gut Werk gebaut iſt, zu Boden“. Schließlich weiſt Luther noch den Irrtum ab, daß alle, die einmal gläubig geworden ſeien, im Glauben blieben, wenn ſie auch nachher wieder in Sünde fielen. Unſinnige Menſchen nennt er die, die ſo lehrten. — Im 4., 5., 6., 7. und 8. Kapitel kommt Luther auf die Mittel und Darreichungsarten der göttlichen Gnade zu ſprechen, nämlich auf das Evangelium, die Taufe, das Sakrament des Altars, die Schlüſſel und die Beichte. In all dieſen Stücken iſt zwiſchen ſeiner Darlegung und der der Auguſtana kein Unterſchied, und der 5., 9., 10., 11. und 25. Artikel derſelben werden beſtätigt.

Bei dem Artikel vom Abendmahl kann aber Luther nicht umhin, scharf gegen die Kelchentziehung und Transsubstantiation vorzugehen. Betreffs jener sagt er, daß wir in Gottes Namen diejenigen verdammen und verfluchen, so „beide Gestalt nicht allein lassen anstehen" (omittunt), sondern sogar verbieten und verdammen, da doch „die einige Gestalt", da man bloß das Brot austeile, gegen die Einsetzung Christi sei, wie sie durch Christum gestiftet und befohlen worden sei. Betreffs der Transsubstantiation sagt Luther, daß es nichts weiter als spitzbübische Sophisterei sei, zu lehren, daß Brot und Wein ihr natürliches Wesen verlören und nur die Gestalt und Farbe des Brotes bleibe; und das beweist er mit Pauli Worten „Das Brot, das wir brechen" und „Also esse er von diesem Brot". — Bei der Beichte fügt Luther einen Passus gegen den Enthusiasmus ein, der ihm ganz besonders zuwider ist. Unter diesem versteht er den gefährlichen Irrtum, daß man sich rühme, ohne das Wort Gottes den Geist zu haben und demgemäß das Wort der Heiligen Schrift nach eigenem Gutdünken richten, deuten und dehnen zu können. So sei der Papst ein Enthusiast, da er sich rühme, in seinem Herzen seien alle heiligen Gedanken, und wenn er etwas sage, so sei das alles Geist und Recht, wenn es auch noch so sehr gegen die Schrift verstoße. Das sei aber eitel Teufelswerk und führe zu straffälligem Eigendünkel, sei aller Ketzerei, auch des Papsttums und Mohammeds, Ursache, Kraft und Macht. Darum, so urteilt Luther, „sollen und müssen wir darauf beharren, daß Gott nicht will mit uns handeln denn durch sein äußerlich Wort und Sakrament. Alles aber, was ohn' solch Wort und Sakrament gerühmt wird, das ist des Teufels". — über den Bann schweigt die Augustana. Luther aber geht im 9. Artikel darauf ein und macht einen Unterschied zwischen dem großen und dem kleinen Bann. Der große, da der Papst Könige und Kaiser, ja ganze Länder mit dem Bannfluch belegte, sei nichts weiter als eine weltliche Strafe. Die Seligkeit komme dabei nicht in Betracht. Anders aber sei der kleine, der christliche Bann, da offenbarliche, halsstarrige Sünder nicht zum Sakrament zuzulassen seien, bis sie sich besserten und die Sünde mieden. Und diesen Bann solle man ja nicht mit dem großen verwechseln, damit man nicht Weltliches und Geistliches miteinander vermische. — Auch über die Priesterweihe schweigt die Augustana. Luther aber geht auf sie ein und sagt im 10. Artikel, daß, wenn die Bischöfe ordentliche, tüchtige, zum Amt berechtigte Pastoren nicht ordinierten, sondern sie verfolgten und verdammten, die Kirche dennoch nicht ohne Diener bleiben dürfe. Darum „wollen und sollen wir selbst ordinieren tüchtige Personen zu solchem Amt; und das haben sie uns nicht zu verbieten noch zu nehmen, auch [nicht] nach ihrem eigenen Rechte". — Betreffs der Priesterehe stimmt Artikel 11 der Sätze Luthers genau mit dem 23. Artikel der Augustana überein, nur daß diese die Sache viel ausführlicher behandelt. — Auch betreffs der Lehre von der Kirche stimmt Luther im 12. Artikel genau mit dem

7. Artikel der Auguſtana überein, indem beide erklären, daß die Kirche die Gemeine aller Gläubigen ſei, bei denen das Evangelium rein gepredigt und die Sakramente nach Chriſti Einſetzung verwaltet würden. Aber während die Auguſtana auf die gleichförmigen Zeremonien zu ſprechen kommt, daß ſie nämlich nicht zur Einigkeit der Kirche gehörten, ſo geht Luther ſcharf gegen den Papſt vor, der da ſage, er und der Klerus allein ſeien die Kirche. Nein, ſagt Luther, „wir geſtehen es ihnen nicht zu, daß ſie die Kirche ſeien, und wollen's auch nicht hören, was ſie unter dem Namen der Kirche gebieten und verbieten". — Noch einmal kommt Luther im 13. Artikel auf die Rechtfertigung zurück, indem er ſie mit den guten Werken verbindet, und beſtätigt damit den 4. und 6. Artikel der Auguſtana. Er wiederholt, was er ſchon geſagt hat, daß die Rechtfertigung darin beſtehe, daß Gott um unſers Mittlers, des HErrn JEſu Chriſti, willen uns für gerecht und heilig hält, und fügt dann hinzu, daß „auf ſolchen Glauben, Verneurung und Vergebung der Sünden gute Werke folgen", die, wenn ſie auch ſündlich und mangelhaft ſind, doch dem lieben Gott wohlgefallen. Die Auguſtana bringt jedoch im 20. Kapitel über den Glauben und die guten Werke noch eine längere Darlegung, worin die Werklehre der Papiſten verdammt wird. Die Papiſten hatten bisher nur Werklehre getrieben; jetzt aber ſagten ſie, daß Glaube und Werke vor Gott gerecht machten. Das aber, ſagt Luther, ſei durchaus verwerflich und verdammlich, denn auf Werke bauen heiße nichts weiter als Chriſtum verachten und einen eigenen Weg zu Gott nehmen. Die Lehre, daß der Glaube allein gerecht mache, ſei klar in der Schrift geoffenbart, und ſie allein gebe dem Gewiſſen Ruhe und Frieden. Darum, weil man im Papſttum den Menſchen dieſen Troſt vorenthalten habe, ſei es nötig, dieſe Lehre vom Glauben fleißig zu treiben. Dieſer Glaube ſei kein bloßes Wiſſen, wie es auch die Teufel hätten, ſondern das feſte Vertrauen auf Gottes Gnade um Chriſti willen, und nur ein mit Gott Verſöhnter kenne Gott recht und könne ihm recht dienen. Und auf dieſen Glauben folgten dann die Werke, aber nicht in dem Sinne, daß man darauf vertraue, Gnade zu verdienen, ſondern um Gottes willen und Gott zulieb. Wer dieſen Glauben habe, dem mache der Heilige Geiſt das Herz geſchickt, gute Werke zu tun. Darum ſei die Lehre vom Glauben nicht zu ſchelten, als ob ſie gute Werke verböte, ſondern vielmehr zu rühmen, da ſie lehre, gute Werke zu tun. — Im 14. Artikel kommt Luther auf die Klöſtergelübde zu ſprechen und beſtätigt, wenn auch nur ganz kurz, die lange Ausführung des 27. Artikels der Auguſtana. Während Luther einfach ſagt, daß die Kloſtergelübde ſtracks wider den erſten Hauptartikel ſtritten, daß es Chriſtum verleugnen heiße, wenn man durch das Kloſterleben in den Himmel kommen wolle, und daß es eine Gotteslästerung ſei, wenn man ſage, das Kloſterleben ſei der Taufe gleich, ſo führt das die Auguſtana weiter aus, indem ſie das Vorgeben der Papiſten an den Pranger ſtellt, daß man durch das Kloſterleben Vergebung der Sünden

und Rechtfertigung verdiene und daß man dadurch mehr erwürbe als mit allen andern von Gott verordneten Ständen. Mithin sei das Klosterleben durchaus verdammlich, zumal da es zur Ehelosigkeit verurteile; und wie es um die Keuschheit der Menschen stehe, wisse man wohl. Gottes Ordnung und Gebot könne durch Klostergelübde nicht aufgehoben werden. Aller Gottesdienst, der von Menschen erdacht und erwählt sei ohne Gottes Befehl und Gebot, sei wider Gott; denn die Heilige Schrift sage Matth. 15, 9: Sie dienen mir vergebens mit ihren Menschengeboten. St. Paulus lehre überall klar und deutlich, daß man nur durch den Glauben vor Gott gerecht werde, und daher sei das Klosterleben ein unrechter, falscher Gottesdienst, da die Mönche lehrten, das Klosterleben tue genug für die Sünden. Ein gottloses und wider Gottes Gebot getanes Gelübde sei unbündig und nichtig, Christo werde damit seine Ehre geraubt, der allein uns gerecht mache. Ferner wird der greuliche Irrtum gestraft, daß man im Klosterleben überflüssig gute Werke tue, die man andern zugute kommen lassen könne, und daß man die Leute überrede, in den erdichteten geistlichen Ordensständen zu leben, sei christliche Vollkommenheit. So werde die Gerechtigkeit des Glaubens und der rechte, wahre Gottesdienst verdunkelt. Wenn das Volk höre, der ledige Stand im Klosterleben sei allein heilig, lebe es mit beschwertem Gewissen im Ehestande. Wenn es höre, die Bettler (im Klosterwesen) seien allein vollkommen, so könne es nicht wissen, ob man mit gutem Gewissen Güter besitzen dürfe. Und wenn nun gar etliche Weib und Kind verlassen hätten und ins Kloster gegangen seien, weil das Klosterleben Gott besser gefalle als der andern Leben, so sei zu sagen, daß es ein gefährlicher Stand sei, der Gottes Gebot nicht für sich habe, hingegen ein guter und vollkommener Stand, der sich auf Gottes Gebot gründe. Die Augustana faßt schließlich alle gottlosen Meinungen und Irrtümer, die an dem Klosterleben kleben, zusammen und sagt: „Dieweil denn solches alles falsch, eitel und erdichtet ist, so macht es auch die Klostergelübde nichtig und unbündig." — Den Beschluß macht Luther im 15. Artikel mit den Menschensatzungen, über die in der Augsburgischen Konfession kein besonderer Artikel enthalten ist. Luther sagt: „Daß die Papisten sagen, Menschensatzungen dienen zur Vergebung der Sünden oder verdienen die Seligkeit, das ist unchristlich und verdammt."

Wir sehen klar, Luther stimmt in all den von ihm namhaft gemachten Punkten genau mit der Augsburgischen Konfession überein. Auch nicht die leiseste Abweichung von ihr findet sich in seinen Sätzen. Daher ist es auch schlechterdings keine Frage, daß er es in den von ihm nicht namhaft gemachten Stücken der Lehre mit der Augustana hält und daß er in den von ihm behandelten Stücken, von denen in der Augustana nicht die Rede ist, ihr nicht widerspricht. Derselbe Geist und Sinn, der die Augustana durchweht, findet auch in seinen Sätzen seinen Ausdruck. Beide ziehen alle christlichen Lehren allein aus der Heiligen Schrift, ohne

ſich irgendwie von menſchlichen Meinungen beeinfluſſen zu laſſen, und daher iſt beiden das Papſttum der allerſchrecklichſte Greuel, weil es die Schrift beiſeiteläßt und die Seligkeit bloß auf menſchliche Meinungen gründet. In beiden iſt das Papſttum gerichtet, und das Urteil, das über dasſelbe gefällt iſt, wird beſtehen bis ans Ende der Tage, wo der Papſt endlich dem letzten Gericht verfällt.

Gott aber ſei ewig Lob und Dank für dieſe Einhelligkeit in der Lehre! Schlimm wäre es geweſen, wenn Luther irgendwie von der Auguſtana abgewichen wäre. Wie hätten da die Feinde jubiliert! So aber war ihnen dieſe Freude nicht gegönnt, und beide, Luthers Sätze und die Augsburgiſche Konfeſſion, ſtehen in ihrer Einigkeit da als Grundpfeiler des wahren, chriſtlichen Glaubens, die auch die Pforten der Hölle nicht zu ſtürzen vermögen.

Milwaukee, Wis. O. F. Hattſtädt

Study on Heb. 4, 9—13

Eisenach Epistle for Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity

The author of the Letter to the Hebrews calls the attention of his readers to the message of the Son, 1, 2; the Prophet equal with God, 1, 2—14, whose message deserves to be heard and accepted, 2, 1. 2, since it was confirmed by God Himself, 2, 3. 4, and since it speaks of so sure and so marvelous a salvation, 2, 5—17. Therefore they ought to consider their Apostle and High Priest, Christ Jesus, greater than Moses, 3, 1—6, and not harden their hearts in unbelief lest they, like unbelieving Israel of old, fail to obtain the promised rest, 3, 7—19. For unto us, like unto them, is promised a rest. When God promised a rest to His people, He thought not merely of the rest in Canaan; He had in mind another rest, that in heaven. Unbelieving Israel lost both Canaan and heaven, and even those who entered into the Promised Land had not thereby entered into the rest promised to God's people; for if Joshua had brought them to rest, God would not afterward have spoken of another day, 4, 1—8. The Epistle-lesson for the Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity, linking up with the standard Gospel-lesson for the day, pleads with all Christians to labor to enter into the rest remaining for the people of God and promised to them in His unfailing Word.

"There remaineth therefore a rest to the people of God," v. 9. Since God in His holy Word, Ps. 95, through His prophet pleads with the people, the Jews living in Canaan, *i. e.*, the promised land of rest, not to harden their hearts against His invitation to enter into His rest, Joshua could not possibly have brought Israel to their final resting-place. There must therefore (οὖν, conse-

quently, draws the conclusion from the premises given vv. 4—8) be remaining another rest to the people of God. "The people of God" was the name given to Israel as a nation because this nation had been chosen by God Himself as His own, His peculiar people, to whom in a special manner He had revealed Himself, to whom He had granted privileges and rights granted in like measure to no other people, or nation, on earth. Cp. Rom. 3, 2; 9, 4. 5; Ex. 19, 3—6; Deut. 7, 6—24; 5, 32—40. Within this nation many refused to believe the Word preached to them, Heb. 4, 2, and were therefore not accepted by God as His people, not given the rest promised to the people of God, the true believers among Israel. In the times of the New Testament the Israel of God, the people of God, are all believers, Jews and Gentiles, Gal. 6, 16; Rom. 9, 6—8. 24—26; 1 Pet. 2, 9. 10. To this people of God in its entirety, to all the individual members of this people from Adam and Eve to the last member of the human race received through faith into membership with this peculiar people of God, there remaineth a rest. The very fact that they are members of *God's* people warrants to them the fulfilment of their hopes and expectations, for God is true and His promises cannot fail, being the promises of Omnipotence and Grace, Rom. 15, 8. 9; 2 Cor. 1, 20.

The writer designates this rest as a σαββατισμός, the only time this word occurs in the New Testament. The rest remaining to the people of God is on the order of a sabbatical rest, such as was commanded to the people of the Old Testament, Ex. 20, 8 ff.; 35, 3; Num. 15, 32 ff.; Lev. 23, 3 (assembly); Num. 28, 9 ff. (sacrifice). Israel was to rest from work so that God might have His work in them. Hymn 391, 4. This was the antitype of God's sabbatical rest, Gen. 2, 2. 3, and, like the latter, a prototype of the New Testament rest. Col. 2, 16. 17.

Therefore the writer continues: *"For he that is entered into His rest, he also hath ceased from his own works, as God did from His."* v. 10. "His rest" refers to the rest which God has prepared for His people. God Himself calls it *My rest*, 3, 11; 4, 3. 5; the writer, *His rest*, 3, 18. Every one who enters into God's rest (and only he) shall himself also cease, rest, from his own works. That this rest is not an absolute rest, a *dolce far niente*, complete inactivity, is evident from the fact that the writer compares this cessation from labor to that of God's rest from His works. This rest of God is explained and restricted by v. 4, where the writer quotes Gen. 2, 2. God rested from His works which He had proposed to do during the six days of creation. The activity of Him who needs no rest, Is. 40, 28, and does not rest, Ps. 121, 4; John 5, 17, did not cease; it assumed a different sphere. Creation having ceased, He rejoiced in His finished work, Gen. 1, 31; Prov. 8, 30. 31,

and henceforth preserves and governs all creatures, Is. 40, 26 ff.; 44, 24—28; Heb. 1, 4; Ps. 121.

In like manner, ὥσπερ, every one that has entered into His rest has also ceased, come to a rest (aorist), from his own works. Note the close correspondence of these words with those used of God's rest. The rest of the people of God consists in ceasing from the works proposed for them, allotted to them, in this time and world. The good works which God had before ordained that His Christians should walk in them, Eph. 2, 10, have been accomplished. Now their activities take on a different form. As their bodies are now transformed into spiritual bodies, as they are no longer sinful, mortal, corruptible, imperfect, vile bodies but changed, fashioned like unto the glorified body of their Savior, so their activities are on a much higher plane, purely spiritual, perfectly holy and righteous. No longer will there be for them a sowing in hope, but the joy of harvesting and fruition. No longer will sorrow and sadness, their constant companions in this world, be at their side; for them that rest is forbidden ground. As Christians enter into this rest, joy and gladness will take them at their hand, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away, Is. 35, 10. There will be no more weariness in doing their daily task, no more disappointments and perplexities and self-reproaches. There is God's *rest*. Into that rest shall their works follow them, glorified as they themselves are glorified, all sins washed away, all stains removed; all those imperfections which caused them so much heartache, are deleted from their works, yea, from their memory of these works, even as God remembers their iniquities no more. Jer. 31, 34; Heb. 8, 12. With joy and pleasure shall they behold the works of their hands which they wrought while still on the earth, just as God saw all things He had made and rejoiced, for they were very good. They will join in the chorus of angels and archangels, Rev. 5, 12. 13, and with all the heavenly host serve their God and Savior in that new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, in all holy conversation and godliness, without spot and blameless. 2 Pet. 3, 11—14. That is the sabbatical rest of God, prepared by Him for His own people.

"Let us labor therefore to enter into that rest lest any man fall after the same example of unbelief," v. 11. "Let us labor," make haste, exert ourselves, give diligence, "to enter into that [ἐκείνην] rest," the glory of whose bliss exceeds all human understanding, like which there is no other rest, "lest any man fall after," fall in, *i. e.*, fall into and remain lying in this state, "the same example" (ὑπόδειγμα properly what is shown by being placed under the eyes, a suggestive sign, an example). He had placed before the eyes of his readers the disobedience and unbelief of Israel as

a warning example. "Unbelief," ἀπειθεία, refusing to be persuaded, non-compliance, obstinacy, which is moved neither by the command and the threats of the Law, hence disobedience, nor by the invitation and promise of the Gospel, hence unbelief. The life of these unbelieving Israelites, instead of being an ensample of faith and love and perseverance and loyalty, serves only to show the sad results of unbelief. What a tragedy! Shall we fall in like manner? Shall our life serve no other purpose than to be an example of warning to future generations? Perish the thought! Then let us hasten, use every diligence, to enter into that rest before the door is closed forever and we are too late. Our guilt and consequent punishment would be the greater, since we are no longer living in the time of the Old Testament but are privileged to live in New Testament times, offering so many more advantages and blessings, which increase in like measure our obligation to give the more earnest heed to the things which we have heard, 2, 1—4; cp. 1, 1. 2; 3, 1—6, and since the power and efficacy of the Word remain unchanged. This is the next thought brought out in vv. 12. 13, which are connected with the preceding edmonition by γάρ. The author adds another powerful reason for making haste to enter the rest promised in the Word of God.

"For the Word of God is quick and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and marrow and is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart," v. 12. The Word of God is the subject of this and the following verse. What does the author mean by this term? We may at once dismiss the opinion of a number of interpreters who refer this term to Jesus Christ, the Word of God. Christ is never so called in this epistle, and Meyer correctly states that "the expression was too unusual for it to be employed and understood without further indication in this special sense, where the connection did not even lead up to it." The term "Word of God" is an all-comprehensive one, including every word, every utterance, of God, no matter at what time, in what place, in what manner, it was spoken — whether spoken by the Father, 1, 5—14; by the Son, 2, 12. 13; by the Holy Ghost, 3, 7; whether spoken by angels, 2, 2, or by men, 1, 1; 2, 3. 4; whether by means of oral or of written speech, the word of God recorded in a book from which one may quote, to certain places of which one may refer, 2, 6; 4, 4. 5; whether this Word is recorded in the Pentateuch, 4, 4; 6, 13—7, 28; 9—12, or in the historical books, 1, 5; 11, 30 ff.; 13, 5, or the Prophets, 2, 13; 8, 8—12; 10, 15—17, or the Psalms, 1, 5—14; 2, 6. 12; 3, 7—11; 5, 5. 6. etc.; whether this Word is the Gospel, 4, 2, etc., or the Law, Moral, 10, 30; Ceremonial, 9, 8. Note especially the manner in which the author throughout

the entire epistle speaks of the Old Testament in all its parts as of the Word of God, not only as containing the Word, not only with reference to certain utterances of God, not only in so far as it refers to Christ, is the "cradle of Christ"; no, the Old Testament in its entirety is to him the Word of God; the mere fact that an utterance of God or any fact is recorded in the Bible is to him proof sufficient of the truth of this utterance or fact. (Cp. Dr. Engelder's article on "What the Liberal Theologian Thinks of Verbal Inspiration" in the May and June issues of this periodical.) The author quotes a book as the Word of God. His religion is indeed, if anything, a book religion. Is it on that account a dead, a deadening religion, stifling all activity, leading us into obscurantism and disaster? The writer of Hebrews certainly did not think so.

The Word of God is "quick," ζῶν, living, imbued with life. The present participle is timeless and durative. Though spoken and written hundreds, thousands, of years ago, it is by no means dead ballast, an outworn philosophy of life, of value to us only in a theoretical way, as a record of man's efforts to search out God or of the religious experiences of past ages. No; it is as living and pulsating with life today as it was when it was first written. And it will ever remain alive; the passing years, yea, eons, cannot deprive it of its living power; it is the Word of God, which liveth and abideth forever, 1 Pet. 1, 23. Since it is ever alive, it is always "powerful," ἐνεργής, active, at work. Never for a moment does its activity cease, its dynamic energy stop. In no instance does it return void to its Author; always it accomplishes that which He pleases; unceasingly it prospers in the thing whereto He sent it, whether that be to serve as a savor of death unto death or as a savor of life unto life. For it is not man's word; it is the Word of God, higher than man's word as the heavens are higher than the earth. This live, active Word of God is "sharper than any two-edged sword." When John on Patmos saw one like the Son of Man standing in the midst of His congregation, represented by seven golden candle-sticks, he saw coming out of His mouth a sharp two-edged sword, His Word, Rev. 1, 16. A two-edged sword is the better able to penetrate deep into the body and sever the more quickly and thoroughly the members of the body. The Word of God is sharper than any other sword. No man-made blade can equal, or even approach, in point of keenness this sharpest of all swords. Man-made swords may cut in two heavy bars of iron; Damascus blades have been known to be so keen as to cut through a soft feather pillow. The sword of the Word of God is sharper, keener than that. It pierces, it penetrates, "even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit." Again the present participle denotes

timeless and durative action. It is continually piercing, always keen, never dulled, no matter how long and how often it is active in piercing and dividing. Witness the power of the words spoken by God on the first days of creation. From the moment the word was spoken, alive, active, keen, piercing, it divided the light from the darkness, the waters from the waters, the dry land from the seas. And to this day by virtue of the word spoken six thousand years ago light is divided from darkness, waters from waters, dry land from the seas. So it will remain until God Himself will revoke His word, until He will speak that word whereby heavens and earth will pass away and make room for the new earth, the new heavens, and time will pass into eternity. Cp. also Gen. 8, 22.

As the word on the first day penetrated primeval darkness and divided darkness and light, so the written Word of God pierces man, to whom it is addressed, penetrates into his inmost being, "even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit and of the joints and marrow." What is the meaning of these words? There are many different interpretations. In his *Greek-English Lexicon*, Thayer says: "Many take μερισμός actively: 'up to the dividing,' *i. e.*, so far as to cleave asunder or separate; but it is not easy to understand what the *dividing* of the 'soul' is. Hence it is more correct, I think, and more in accordance with the context, to take the word passively (just as other verbal substantives ending in μος are used, . . .) and translate even to the division, etc., *i. e.*, to that most hidden spot, the dividing line between soul and spirit, where the one passes into the other." We cannot agree with Thayer. Neither the noun which occurs only once more, Heb. 2, 4, nor the verb denotes a separation of two objects previously united, but invariably the dividing of one object into various parts, Luke 12, 3. Such dividing may be done for the purpose of distribution, Mark 6, 41, the noun being used in this sense Heb. 2, 4; of imparting, Rom. 12, 3; 1 Cor. 7, 17; 2 Cor. 10, 13; Heb. 7, 2. This dividing is quite frequently a disturbing one, a dividing that causes unrest, dissension, strife, 1 Cor. 1, 13; 7, 34;* Matt. 12, 25. 26; Mark 3, 24—26. Moreover, the passive sense, advocated by Thayer, will not suit the second pair named by the writer, joints and marrow; they do not "pass one into the other." We therefore prefer

* In 1 Cor. 7, 34, where there are a number of variant readings, many interpreters and critics connect μεμέρισται with v. 33 and translate: "And he is divided," *viz.*, in the matter of cares, some calling him in one direction, some in the other. See Lenski, *Interpretation of First and Second Corinthians*, p. 326 f. Even if one connects it with v. 34, there is here not a separation of two things formerly connected, but a division of care, the one caring only for the Lord, the other dividing her cares between the Lord and her husband.

the interpretation according to which the four items named are the objects divided, each one for itself being cut into pieces. That is in full keeping with the general usage, with the context, and with Scriptural teaching.

Briefly stated, the author means to say that the Word of God pierces, divides, judges, both the psychic and physical elements of man, both the inner life and the body in and through which this inner life operates and is manifested. The inner nature is described by three terms, ψυχή, πνεῦμα, and καρδία. It would only confuse the hearers if the pastor would try to explain the exact meaning of these words at great length. All denote life in one or the other form or manifestation. The best definition, in our opinion, is given by Lenski in his *Commentary on Corinthians,* p. 729: "Man is composed of two parts, the one material, the other immaterial. The latter is designated in Greek by two terms, ψυχή and πνεῦμα. By ψυχή is meant the immaterial part as it animates the material part or body, making it alive. By πνεῦμα is meant the same immaterial part, but as it is open to impressions from the supreme πνεῦμα, the Spirit of God. Death separates the immaterial from the material part, but ψυχή and πνεῦμα cannot be separated, being one entity; these two can only be distinguished as two sides of a unit." The heart may be defined as the seat of life in its various manifestations, as physical, mental, moral, emotional, etc., life. "Joints and marrow" are usually interpreted in a figurative sense, as "the ligaments and marrow of the soul and spirit," denoting "the innermost and hidden depth of the rational life of man." Meyer. That seems rather far fetched, and the few examples from classical Greek adduced are not convincing, because there the expression is μυελὸς ψυχῆς, while here two pair of words are placed side by side, and the τε . . . καί does not connect the second pair with the former, but simply joins the two terms *joints* and *marrow* together closely. Cp. on this use of the double conjunction Luke 22, 66; Acts 1, 1; 8, 12; 24, 15; etc. Ἐνθύμησις denotes what is in, or produced by, the θυμός, thoughts arrived at not by a process of calm, logical reasoning, but on the spur of the moment, motivated by some emotion or passion (cp. Matt. 9, 4; 12, 25), while ἔννοια denotes what is in, or produced by, the νοῦς, the understanding, intelligence, reason. Both are ascribed to the heart, since the heart is in the Greek language the seat of intellect, emotion, will. Hence the meaning is that both inwardly and outwardly, both as to his soul, his spirit, his heart, and as to his body, man is affected, and affected deeply, stirred to the innermost depths of soul and body, by the living, active, sharp, penetrating, dividing power of the Word of God, be that Law or Gospel. On the soul-stirring power of the Law, piercing the heart of man, dividing

it against itself, causing strife, dissension, the thoughts accusing, excusing one another, read *Smalcald Articles*, II. Of the Law; III. Of Repentance (*Trigl.*, p. 479). The preaching of the Gospel has the same effect. Christ Himself assures us that the Holy Ghost through the preaching of the Gospel convicts man of sin, of righteousness, of judgment. His going to the Father to procure righteousness, His defeat of the devil, salvation to all that believe on Him, that is Gospel pure and unadulterated. And this word carries a certain conviction into the heart of the unbeliever. Christ tells us that the unbeliever, when hearing the Gospel will be convicted by the Holy Spirit of its truth. Their own conscience will tell them that there is no other righteousness than that procured by Christ, that there is no other way to salvation than that pointed out to them in the Gospel. And so long as they refuse to accept this message of pardon and peace, their heart and soul and spirit will be divided against itself; they will be torn by conflicting thoughts and emotions; they will be constantly kicking against the prick which the Word of God pressed deep into their soul, constantly fighting the sword piercing ever deeper, causing never-ceasing, ever-increasing despair and damnation. There is no peace, saith my God, to the wicked, Is. 57, 21. The Word of God — the Law, commanding peace with God and man, the Gospel, granting that peace to all that believe — will in all that reject it work peacelessness.

This piercing, dividing power of the Word of God is not confined to the soul and spirit; it has the same effect on the joints and marrow of the body. Anything that influences the soul, or spirit, which dwells in, and operates through, the body and its members, naturally reacts on the body and its component parts. That is especially true of the soul-stirring, spirit-swaying power of the Word of God. When David refused to listen to the Word of God, so well known to him, so often coming to his mind after his sad fall, not only his soul but also his body suffered untold agony, Ps. 32, 3. 4. That has been the experience, though not always in so high a degree, of untold thousands who steadfastly refused to obey the Word of God.

Not only the unbelievers, also the believers, have experienced, and will experience throughout their lives, the power of the living word. To them it has become the savor of life unto life. In and through His Word God hath shined into their hearts, giving to them the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ, 2 Cor. 4, 6. What a blessed division has taken place within their soul and spirit! No longer does Satan hold undisputed sway over them; Christ is now established on the throne of their hearts. No longer are they under the dominion of their sinful flesh; the

Holy Spirit is now their Lord. Rom. 6, 11—23. No longer without Christ, without God, without hope, without peace in this world, but brethren of Jesus, children of God, filled with the blessed hope of eternal life, the peace of God passing understanding ruling in their hearts, heavenly joy and satisfaction the key-note of their lives. Rom. 5, 1 ff. This Gospel with its message of forgiveness and hope and joy, of union and communion with God, gladdens not only the spirit, revives not only the soul, Is. 57, 15—19; 61, 1—3; it heals the body, so that the bones broken by God's hammer of the Law (Jer. 23, 29) again rejoice, again are made whole, Ps. 51, 8; 6, 2 (cp. vv. 8. 9); Heb. 3, 19 (cp. v. 16).

This peace and joy of body and soul, however, is not undisturbed. The Christian is not perfect. He still sins daily, hourly. And the Law of God, searching, probing the inmost heart and spirit, reproaches the Christian for his sin. There is in him a never ceasing division, dissension, the old fighting against the new, the spirit against the flesh. Paul describes this constant division which begins in the conversion of man and continues throughout his life in that chapter of remarkable depth and insight into the inner life of a Christian, Rom. 7. That is a division which affects soul and body. The very fact that a Christian, the farther he advances in sanctification, sees the clearer his imperfection, his lack of fervent love toward his Creator, Savior, Comforter, causes him many a sorrowful hour, many a heartache, many a physical discomfort and anguish. Read penitent David's prayer, Ps. 38, 1—8, and Luther's masterly introduction to this psalm: "This is a psalm of prayer wherein he complains of his sins, which cause anxiety and sorrow to his conscience and permit him to see naught but the arrows of God, that is, wrath, threats, death, and hell. This sorrow consumes marrow, bones, strength, and vigor, distorts the face, the color, all senses, one's whole bearing. For really to feel sin and the despair of an evil conscience is agony above all agony." (Vol. XIV.) Cp. also Ps. 119, 120; Hab. 3, 1. 16; the agonized cry of Paul after having described the division within himself, Rom. 7, 24 (this *body* of death!). So the division continues throughout the life of a Christian, a life made up of battlings, dissension, groanings, while waiting for the consummation of that hope engendered in us by the Word of God, our final adoption, to wit, the redemption not only of our soul, but also of our body, Rom. 8, 23. But throughout this constant division the living, active Word of God not only keeps alive, constantly stirs up afresh this strife; the same Word, that same Gospel, gives strength to the new man to divide, to separate from that reborn heart the love of sin and fleshly lusts, to conquer the old man, to serve God in holiness and righteousness forever.

The apostle adds another clause, further describing the activity of the Word of God. It is "a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." We have brought out the distinction between thoughts and intents above. The word translated "discerner," κριτικός, means one able to judge, skilled in separating, κρίνειν, truth from falsehood, good from bad, in sifting all the evidence in a given case, and then, on the basis of such thorough investigation, to render his descision, his sentence of guilty or not guilty. This power to be the criticiser, the judge, of man is inherent in the Word of God. Man, vain fool that he is, proudly calls himself a critic of the Bible. Man dares to let his reason, his thoughts and intents, sit in judgment upon the Word of God, accept whatever he pleases, reject whatever does not seem in agreement with his prejudices. The fact of the matter is that not man, but the Word is the critic, the judge of man's actions, his words, his very thoughts and intents. Human judges can judge only what is open and manifest. The Word of God goes deeper; it penetrates to the very bottom of the matter; it goes down into the heart and sifts, separates, classifies, judges, the inmost emotions and conclusions, the secret desires, the hidden well-springs of his words and actions. And according to its findings it judges. He that believeth shall be saved, is declared righteous; he that believeth not shall be condemned. This sentence is pronounced upon man already in this world. We have heard that in and through the Word the Holy Spirit convicts the world of its unbelief, John 16, 8. 9. Similarly Christ says to the Jews: John 6, 45. 46. Moses accuses them even while they are alive, not Moses in person but through his word written in the Bible. The Word proclaimed by man forgives or retains sin, John 20, 23; Matt. 18, 18. The Word gives life eternal already in this world, John 5, 24; 6, 63. 68. The Word of Christ written in the Bible, 1 Pet. 1, 11, shall judge mankind in the Last Day, John 12, 47—50. The Word of God is the judge of the world.

The apostle has described the intensive power of the Word of God; now he brings out the thought that extensively, its power is no less marvelous. *"Neither is there any creature that is not manifest in his sight, but all things are naked and opened to the eye of him with whom we have to do,* v. 13. We see no reason to assume a change of subject here from the Word of God to God Himself. Neither the context, as Lenski states, nor the expression "before his eyes," as Meyer holds, requires such a change. The context as little demands that we understand a person here as the previous verse requires a person. The attribution of eyes to the Word of God is in keeping with its personification in v. 12 and no more unsuitable than the attribution of eyes to the wheels of

the chariot in Ezekiel's vision, Ezek. 1, 18; 10, 12, this chariot being a symbol of the glory of God revealed in the Gospel. (See this periodical, Vol. VII, p. 184.) In order to judge the thoughts of the hearts of all men, it must be able to look into the hearts of all men and hence to direct its "eyes" upon all men. The Word of God, just because it is *God's* Word, fixes its gaze on humanity, and before its piercing, penetrating eyes all men are naked, "stripped of all natural or artificial covering" (Delitzsch). They present themselves to the eyes of the Word as they really and truly are. The Word penetrates the robe of outward, often hypocritical virtue wherewith men succeed in cloaking their inward depravity before the eyes of their fellow-men. It penetrates through all the shallow excuses, the scientific objections, advanced by unbelievers. It sees them all, not one being hidden, invisible, before its eyes, and sees them all in their true state. All are sinners, Rom. 3, 10—12. 23; 1, 29—31. If there is to be a justification of mankind, it must be in the manner described in Rom. 3, 24—28. Another very significant expression is used by the apostle, the force of which is unfortunately lost in the translation "opened." Τραχηλίζειν means to seize by the throat and throw back the head. No matter what efforts man makes to escape the all-seeing, piercing Word of God, they are useless. Before this Word there is no escape; all are forced to face it, whether they will or no. The Word of God comes to man irrespective of his wishes, and it demands a decision; one must either accept it or reject it. There is no middle ground, no possibility of neutrality. *We* must face the issue proposed by the Word. That is the application, the solemn admonition, which the apostle makes at the conclusion of this majestic passage. "With whom we have to do," πρὸς ὃν ἡμῖν ὁ λόγος, towards which for us the Word. Our word must be directed toward the Word of God. Note the emphatic position of ἡμῖν. *We,* the apostle himself and every one of his readers, we all, must speak to this Word, must answer its demands, must give word in response to its word. What shall our word be? Shall it be: I believe, O Lord; help Thou mine unbelief? Shall it be: Away with this foolishness? Shall it be the answer which Felix gave? Acts 24, 25. Shall it be Is. 6, 8 or Ex. 4, 13? Answer we must. Silence would in this case be speaking louder than words. For the Word of God is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart. We may seek to screen our disobedience with pious words; we may succeed in hiding our true state before our fellow-men; that will not help us. Here we have to do with the Word of God, the eternal God, a Word that is ever alive, ever active, ever judging, ever demanding an answer. It will not let man go. It fastens itself in his memory. Business, pleasure, may drown out its voice temporarily, but it will

always return, always convicting, condemning unbelief and the unbeliever; always justifying, sanctifying, saving, whosoever accepts its good tidings of great joy.

This general truth in vv. 12. 13 serves the apostle as a powerful motivation for his urgent plea in v. 11; hence the *for*, v. 12. The Word of God offers to us the rest prepared by Him. The Word, living, active, powerful, is able to work faith in the hearts of man. The Word makes that rest our own. The Word, piercing, penetrating, knows whether our profession of faith is sincere or hypocritical. The Word fills the saddened, weary heart and spirit of the believer with heaven-born joy and peace. The Word creates unrest, disquietude, in the heart of all who refuse to accept its invitation to enter into God's rest. The Word will judge all men; they will have to give account for their attitude over against its pleas. The Word will reject all who rejected it. The Word will open the portals to eternal rest to all that believed its marvelous message. Lord, open Thou by Thy Word our hearts to hear, to accept, to preserve Thy holy Word. Hymn 2, 1. 2.

The rich contents of this passage may be presented to the congregation in various manners. We shall submit a few outlines covering the entire text: *Let Us Labor to Enter into Our Rest.* 1. It is so precious a rest. 2. It is offered so freely in the living Word. 3. Rejection of this offer is so serious a matter. — *The Tragedy of Unbelief.* 1. It rejects the rest prepared for the people of God. 2. It violates the majesty of the Word of God. — *We Have to Do with the Living Word of God.* 1. Therefore beware of unbelief. 2. Therefore confidently accept its invitation. — On the basis of vv. 9—11, one may speak on the rest prepared by God, a rest like God's, a rest for believers only. Vv. 12. 13 will give occasion to point out the power of God's Word. Intensively, it pierces body and soul; extensively, no man can escape its penetrating eye.

THEO. LAETSCH

Outlines on the Eisenach Epistle Selections

Nineteenth Sunday after Trinity

JAS. 5, 13—20

Through faith in Christ Jesus we Christians are members of the Church of our Savior, Eph. 2, 19—22; 4, 4—6. This is truly an unspeakably great gift of our God.

All believers are members of the body of Christ together with us, Rom. 12, 4. 5; 1 Cor. 12, 12 ff. This truth is not to be considered a mere theoretical proposition, but is to be put into practise, 1 Cor. 12, 26. Especially in our times and in the hustle and bustle of

city life the Christians often remain strangers to one another. This is not in accordance with God's will. In the concluding verses of the epistle St. James, besides teaching other important lessons, admonishes us regarding

A Christian's Concern for His Fellow-Christians

1. In bodily distress 2. In distress of conscience
3. In defection from the truth

1

Our text addresses the individual Christian, urging upon him a Christian conduct in several situations of life. It also admonishes the Christians regarding their attitude and actions toward their fellow-Christians in these situations. We shall restrict ourselves to the latter.

"Is any sick among you?" Sickness is one of the chief characteristics of this vale of tears, the source of great misery and distress. Practically every one of us has experienced this scourge either himself or in his family. There is real suffering. Surely, "whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it," 1 Cor. 12, 26.

The Christians are not to ignore this distress. The elders of the church are to visit him. A congregation obligates its pastor to minister to the sick and should not overburden him with so many matters as to make it difficult for him to perform this important part of his official duties.

He is to pray over him that is sick. This direction is no argument in favor of Christian Science. The pastor is not to supplant the physician. Luke 5, 31 surely applies here. In illness the Christian is to use every God-given means to regain his health. But unless God blesses the efforts of the physician, no cure can be effected. Such prayer is naturally offered by the patient, but his fellow-Christians should join in prayer with him. This prayer is to be a confident prayer, v. 15, but is also to resemble the prayer of the Savior in Gethsemane.

This is to serve as a guide also for all Christians in visiting their fellow-Christian in bodily illness. They have one powerful means of helping him — prayer. This is much better than the ordinary conversations at the sick-bed, which are often a torture to the patient.

Besides, the elders are to anoint him with oil in the name of the Lord, v. 14. These words do not institute extreme unction, but merely refer to a common custom of the Orient of easing and relieving pain by the use of oil. Thus the Christian pastor and the Christians are to follow the example of the good Samaritan; if need be, they should gladly sacrifice time to assist in caring for their fellow-Christian. Thus they show true sympathy.

2

Sin is the source of all trouble, also of illness. We should indeed be careful not to regard persons who must suffer much as specially great sinners, Luke 13, 1—5. But in times of sickness the conscience is often aroused and reminded of sins, v. 15. An aroused conscience causes greater distress than physical illness. The sinner attempting to conceal his sins often endures agonies, Ps. 32, 3. 4.

What can we do to help the Christian brother in his grief? V. 16 we read: "Confess your faults one to another." If the sinner is to unburden his heart to you, he must have confidence in you that you will not judge him unmercifully, that you will respect his confidence, that you will do all in your power to help him.

"Pray one for another." God alone can forgive sins, and He does forgive them. Therefore you can confidently pray with your distressed brother. It is self-evident that you will use the precious Gospel to assure him of forgiveness. Such believing prayer is not in vain, vv. 16 b—18.

3

In the last part of our text St. James refers to the greatest danger. The fellow-Christian has erred from the truth. This does not mean a temporary doubt, with which we are often afflicted, but a fundamental error, which causes the loss of faith. Strictly speaking, such a one is no longer our brother, is no longer a Christian, and is facing eternal death.

Let us not be satisfied with regretting the fact that such a one is lost, nor let us be deterred by the fear that it may be difficult to convince him of his error; let us neither be wearied by rebuffs. Rather let us seriously ponder v. 20, consider the great stake, and implore God's help in this important undertaking. What a joy when the lost sheep returns to the fold!

In doing this, we are following in the footsteps of our Savior, proving ourselves His true disciples. May God grant us grace to become more and more perfect in these good works to the glory of His holy name!

PAUL F. KOEHNEKE

Twentieth Sunday after Trinity

ROM. 14, 1—9

With the 11th chapter of his Epistle to the Romans St. Paul has concluded the doctrinal portion of his letter. In the remaining chapters he deduces practical lessons. Sum and substance of all these instructions may be given in a verse included in this text: "Whether we live or die, we are the Lord's." This is the natural and inevitable conclusion: After the Lord has received us as His own, we must live as His own, follow His commandments. So the

apostle speaks of piety in general, the use of God's gifts, the practise of various Christian virtues, our civil duties; finally, at the end of chap. 13, we find a special motive for using great earnestness in performing these moral duties: The end is near. — But there are phases of Christian life and activity which are not covered by a specific command; in our text the apostle exhorts to

Let us see **Christian Toleration**

1. In what matters Christian toleration is to be exercised
2. How it is to be exercised

1

St. Paul speaks of those who are "weak in the faith." They are not faithless; they are true Christians, fully persuaded as to the essentials of Christian faith, all those points that are plainly stated in Scripture ("God hath received him," v. 3). But there are certain things in which they have not yet reached the full conviction which others have attained. What were these things? Vv. 2. 6. These words leave room for various explanations. Perhaps these persons were ascetically inclined; thought it best for their own spiritual life not to eat meat or drink wine, v. 21, and to set aside special days for devotion and Christian activities; not with a view of meriting favor or reward, but solely because they deemed it profitable. Or perhaps they were Jewish Christians, who still thought it best to adhere to the old distinctions between clean and unclean meats or (because it was difficult to ascertain whether the meat they bought was not part of a heathen sacrifice) not to eat meat at all; because wine was universally abused, it would be best to abstain from the drinking of it altogether; because they found the special holidays of the Old Covenant good for their own spiritual life, they continued to maintain the old custom.

This, then, does not apply to matters that are definitely decided, by command or prohibition, in the divine Word. But there are many things not covered by divine instructions; beyond general principles God has given no command regarding meat and drink (only the abuse forbidden), clothing (only modesty enjoined, pomp and ostentation forbidden), holidays (only the command to hear God's Word diligently), all the externals of divine services, the amount of our contributions for the Lord's work, amusements (only sinful pleasures forbidden), etc. These, then, are matters in which Christian toleration is to be practised. — How?

2

Vv. 1. 3. Those who are strong enough to free themselves of such scruples must not despise the weak, as though they were better Christians, much less condemn them as unchristians; on

the contrary, they must receive them as brethren. They may indeed try to relieve them of their unnecessary doubts, but finally must allow them to retain their own convictions. They should even be careful how they use their own Christian liberty, vv. 20—22.

The weak, on the other hand, must not condemn the others because they do things which they themselves feel constrained to avoid; must not give room to the thought that they are better, more conscientious Christians, thus drifting into pharisaic self-righteousness. Both must be on their guard lest they pass uncharitable judgments on others, their thoughts and motives; remembering that in these things every one must feel his own responsibility to his Lord and act as he thinks right, without judging the other, vv. 3. 4.

There are conditions, however, under which such indifferent things cease to be indifferent. They must be done unto the Lord, v. 6, to the honor of God; for all our life must be lived unto the Lord, v. 8. As soon as something I do (or fail to do) conflicts with the obligation I owe to the Lord, it ceases to be an adiaphoron and becomes evil. — Furthermore, we must be fully persuaded that we are right in whatever action we take; when in doubt, don't! — Or there may be accompanying circumstances which remove the act from the realm of indifference, *e. g.*, if it leads us into temptation to sin. — There may even be cases where toleration becomes wrong, when people try to impose adiaphora on others as an obligation, Gal. 4, 9—11.

The supreme law here, as in all things, is the law of love; love to our fellow-Christians, whose "keepers" we are, and love to our Lord, who has died and is risen for all of us, both weak and strong. Where that law is observed, there will be peace and harmony, each helping the other on the way to life.

THEO. HOYER

Twenty-First Sunday after Trinity

Eph. 6, 5—8.*

Through sin, work has become a burden and a drudgery, Gen. 3, 19. In our thoughts, labor and sorrow usually go together, Ps. 90, 10. This is true especially when we must work for others and under others, as employees in factories, shops, offices, homes, etc. As a result many regard labor as a necessary evil, perhaps even as a curse. The less of it, the better.

But work is designed to be a blessing, not only physically and materially but also for the mind and the soul. It is to be an aid to happiness.

---

* Entire Epistle-lesson, vv. 1—9.

How may a Christian Workman Find Satisfaction and Joy in His Daily Round of Labor?

1. *By cultivating a truly Christian attitude of mind*
2. *By drawing constant inspiration from the dignity of his work*
3. *By looking forward to the compensation that really matters*

1

In order to find real satisfaction and joy in our work, even under adverse conditions, we must emancipate our minds from the current ideas and prejudices propagated by worldly-minded persons and strive to cultivate *a truly Christian attitude of mind.*

A) *Toward our employers.* They are our "masters according to the flesh," v. 5. In everything which pertains to the work which they have engaged us to do, we are subject to them. This is both reasonable and Scriptural. Accordingly our attitude toward them is to be one of —

a) *Obedience.* "Be obedient," v. 5. We are to carry out their commands in *all* things in which they have a right to make demands, Col. 3, 22; Tit. 2, 9; 1 Pet. 2, 18, as long as we are in their employ.

b) *Good will.* "With good will doing service," v. 7. *Expos. Greek Test.*: "Not simply with readiness but with the disposition that wishes one well." The fact that a man is my employer does not remove him from the domain where I am to exercise my love. The very intimacy of our relationship makes the exercise of love all the more imperative. If Paul expected the Christian slaves of his day to render service with good will, how much more ought we to do this!

Questions: Does your attitude toward your employer conform to this Scriptural ideal? Are some of your unpleasant experiences perhaps the result of your failure in this respect?

B) *Toward our work,* vv. 5. 6. At work it is often impossible to distinguish Christians from unbelievers. According to our text the true Christian attitude is characterized by the following "workman's virtues":

a) *Conscientiousness.* "With fear and trembling," v. 5. The Christian workman is to be filled with a solicitous zeal in the discharge of his duties. He is not afraid, in the first place, of being reprimanded or punished but of bungling his task. He is intent upon doing the best he can.

b) *Sincerity.* "In singleness of your heart," v. 5, without any ulterior, dishonorable, selfish motives. He is open and above board in his dealings with his employer and in the discharge of his work. No scheming in the dark. No hypocrisy or shady subterfuges.

c) *Honesty.* "Not with eye-service, as men-pleasers," v. 6. *Expos. Greek Test.*: "Eye-service is the service that is done only when one is under the master's eye, — an obedience to save appearances and gain undeserved favor, which is not rendered when the master is absent as it is when his scrutiny is on us." How many workmen defraud their employers by "loafing on the job" or doing careless work. Not so the consistent Christian. He does the work for which he is being paid and does it as well as he can.

d) *Whole-heartedness.* "From the heart," v. 6; Col. 3, 23. Not mechanically, as an imposed task from which one cannot escape, but with personal interest, just as if the work were being done for one's own self. "For the heart giveth grace unto every art."

Question: Is this your attitude toward your work? Examine yourself.

2

But if we would find satisfaction and joy in our work, we must also draw constant inspiration from *the dignity with which God has invested it.* St. Paul reminds us of the dignity of our daily work by pointing to two facts:

A) By the faithful discharge of our duties in factory, shop, office, home, etc., we are *"doing the will of God,"* v. 6. It is God's commandments that we are carrying out. He is our Master in heaven, v. 9. Faithfulness in our work is faithfulness toward Him. A glorious truth investing our humblest tasks and drabbest workdays with heavenly dignity and splendor. Here we have the divine glorification of the common tasks and drudgeries of life.

B) In all our work, even in the most menial, we are *"the servants of Christ,"* v. 6. Strictly speaking, we cannot divorce our daily work from our worship and religious service. Everything we do in faith is done "as unto Christ," v. 5, and "as to the Lord and not to men," v. 7. Thus our daily work is to be part and parcel of our religious life, a sacrifice of mind and hand laid upon the altar of Christ.

Questions: Are we conscious of doing the will of God when we work for our employers? Do we work as in the presence of God? Do we conduct ourselves as servants of Christ?

3

However, all this is very difficult. Under the stress and the discouragements of commercial and industrial life we often weaken and fall into the ways of the world. To revive our drooping spirits and to incite us to continued faithful service, St. Paul points us to the reward which God Himself holds out to us. In order to find satisfaction and joy in our work, ***we must look forward to this compensation, which alone matters in the end.***

A) It will be a reward *from the Lord Himself,* v. 8, "the reward of inheritance," Col. 3, 24. Since we have served Him, we shall receive our real reward from His hands. Compare our daily wages received from our employer with the reward bestowed by God.

B) It will be *an adequate reward.* Nothing that we have done will be overlooked. "Whatsoever good any man doeth," etc., v. 8. Men may be unfair and stinting but not God. He is always just. In fact, His rewards far exceed our deserts.

C) It will be bestowed without respect of persons, v. 9c. Among men family connections, a winsome personality, expediency, prestige, play an important part in the awarding of rewards, but not with God. He always judges impartially and justly.

Conclusion. — Recapitulation, earnest exhortation to self-examination and repentance. Christ's perfection covers our imperfections and makes satisfaction and joy in our daily work possible.

E. J. FRIEDRICH

Twenty-Second Sunday after Trinity

HEB. 13, 1—9

This long series of weighty admonitions is addressed to people who by the Law had been made to fear exceedingly and to quake, 12, 18—21, but who had fled for refuge to the Gospel, to Jesus 12, 24; addressed to real Christians, members of God's Zion, who receive an eternal kingdom which will survive the removal of heaven and earth. They are grateful, wish to serve God and be faithful, and needs must serve God and endure, 12, 25—29. They are told how.

Instructions Christians Desire and Need

1. How to serve God acceptably *2. How to persevere*

1

V. 1. With faith, God planted also brotherly love in the Christians' heart. To serve God acceptably, we must love those who are very dear to God, John 13, 35; 1 John (entire epistle). No matter how much inconvenience, effort, time, money, it may cost, this vital, indispensable virtue of brotherly love may not be disregarded or skimped.

Vv. 2. 3. Manifestations of brotherly love. Persecuted Christians rightly and wisely sought more healthful climates. Thus their brethren had opportunities to extend unselfish hospitality. Such opportunities come to us today. Take advantage of them. The strangers may not look very promising so far as rewarding or repaying you is concerned. Three men came to Abraham. He did not know them. Yet he entertained them most cheerfully and generously. They turned out to be angels and Jehovah Himself,

Gen. 18. May this consideration help to overcome any reluctance on your part. You never can tell what worthies you may have the privilege of entertaining in unpretentious strangers.

V. 3. Believers being members together, should suffer and weep together, 1 Cor. 12, 25 f.; Rom. 12, 15. What would you desire if you were a prisoner? A letter, a call, a word of cheer, a word of intercession with some person in authority, above all with the Lord? Remember the prisoners and all shut-ins in just that way. The Philippians remembered Paul, Phil. 4, 10. It may soon be your turn to suffer for His name's sake. Today the brother, tomorrow you, — a realization which will deepen your sympathy and should move you to fortify yourself against a similar fiery trial.

V. 4. Unlike the wicked who forbid to marry and would substitute free love for marriage, God holds the estate of matrimony in high regard. He Himself instituted it; Jesus honored it, John 2, 1—11. It is the foundation of the family, the home, the church, the state, of human society, a source of purest happiness, an effective means of curbing evil. You serve God by practising the virtues and works which reflect credit on this holy estate, by abhorring whatever would undermine, disrupt, desecrate it, such as defilement of the marriage bed, marital unfaithfulness, illicit sexual relations. The addition "But whoremongers," etc., is added because there was and is a tendency to condone sex offenses and aberrations as natural, to deceive with vain words, Eph. 5, 3—6. Hence v. 4b needs to be specifically stated.

V. 5. Your conversation, manner of life inclusive of disposition. 1 Tim. 6, 6—10. Here another reason: "I will never leave thee nor forsake thee." To love and cleave to Mammon and to be discontented would be giving God the lie, saying in effect: "I can place no confidence on Thy promise. I have to look to Mammon to provide for me." Do we know what we are doing when we allow love of money to stir, and even to dwell, in our hearts? Matt. 6, 24.

How necessary just these admonitions pertaining to acceptable service of God are today! The author of Hebrews knows our times, puts his finger on the sore spots, and prescribes the remedies.

2

Vv. 6—9 are instructions as to how to persevere in the one and only saving faith. The precious promise v. 5b should enable us to say: v. 6b. The constancy of Christians is menaced by fear of what man can do to them. Instances of this are given vv. 2. 3. From history, also current history (Russia), we may add, that man can torture Christians to death; from experience we know that man can ridicule and cause them grief in little mean ways too numerous to mention. But the Lord being our Helper, what, after all, can

man do that under God's gracious government will not redound to our benefit and prove to be a blessing? Matt. 10, 28. "Remember," etc. V. 7. Man did much evil to them, too. But believing the Lord's promises, they continued to bear witness to the very last. Were they deceived? Fix your eyes on the end of their walk, not on their death so much as to what their death led, on the crown of righteousness, 2 Tim. 4, 8; of life, Rev. 2, 10; of glory, 1 Pet. 5, 4. Such an end you surely desire. Therefore follow their faith. V. 8. Jesus Christ saved our fathers yesterday; He alone saves us today; and forever He is the Way to the Father, the only Way, John 14, 6. In Him alone was and is and will be salvation, Acts 4, 12.

Also false doctrine imperils the perseverance of Christians. Matt. 7, 15. Hence: v. 9. The name of false doctrines, false religions, is legion. Yet essentially they are one. The common denominator of them all is work-righteousness, denying altogether or minimizing man's sinfulness and Christ's merits, magnifying man's natural ability, man's glory. Therefore they are destructive of the Christian religion, a deadly poison. If you are carried about with these divers and strange doctrines, you will become unsettled and perverted in your faith. But you should seek that good thing, an established heart, which is the product of the Gospel of grace. The Law, too, is useful and necessary and must be ever retained. It reveals sin and God as a consuming fire to sinners. It is rule and norm of conduct. But only the Gospel reveals Christ, the Redeemer, the grace of God. Only grace establishes the heart.

Cling to the Law and the Gospel. Learn ever better to use and apply them properly. Concentrate on that, and you are spending your time well, making real progress, 2 Pet. 3, 18, attaining the goal, 1 Pet. 1, 9.

G. BIRKMANN

Twenty-Third Sunday after Trinity

1 Tim. 4, 4—11

The so-called Pastoral Letters of St. Paul are an invaluable manual for Christian ministers, 1 Tim. 3, 15.

However, these letters are of vital interest to hearers also, imparting to them a better understanding and a deeper appreciation of the holy ministry. It is for the good of the hearers that God instructs his ministers. Moreover, from God's instructions to ministers, hearers are to learn much for their own lives. While ministers indeed are to be an example to believers, v. 12, the same divine standards of godliness apply to both. (Well to point out this.)

With this in mind, let us consider with deep interest what our text teaches concerning

"A Good Minister of Jesus Christ"

1. *He is nourished up in the words of faith and of good doctrine*
2. *He refutes error*
3. *He exercises himself unto godliness*
4. *He commands and teaches*

1

A) V. 6. "Words of faith" are the divine Gospel-truths. "Good doctrine," as opposed to error. — Timothy had long since been well instructed. 2 Tim. 1, 5; 2 Tim. 3, 15—17. Paul himself had instructed him. By the power of the Gospel, Timothy had attained the prime qualifications of a good minister, *viz.*, a living faith in his Savior and holy consecration to His service. But as a good minister of Jesus Christ his inward life needed constant nurture and growth, and the means of such nurture and growth are the "words of faith and of good doctrine." 2 Pet. 1, 5; 3, 18; 1 Pet. 2, 2.

B) Apply this to all Christian ministers. The demands upon a modern pastor's time are very exacting. But neither the pastor nor his congregation must ever lose sight of this need of nurture and growth by constant study of, and meditation upon, the "words of faith." Undue curtailment of time for this certainly conflicts with the best interests of both the pastor and his hearers. Only by such nurture will the pastor remain and ever more become, "a good minister of Jesus Christ."

2

Vv. 1—3 false doctrines and practises are mentioned which had arisen even in the days of the apostles. These Timothy was to refute, to "put the brethren in remembrance," in mind, of the wickedness and danger of such teachings. Heresies are characterized as "fables." They are "mere abstract speculations without any connection with the historical realities and practical tendencies of Christianity" (Lange, *Commentary*). They are "profane," unspiritual (Luther), unholy, carnal. Their real origin, v. 1. Finally, heresies are described as "old wives' fables," *i. e.*, as silly, foolish. Cf. 2 Tim. 2, 16. All these Timothy was to reject and refute as opposed to the saving truth and endangering the very salvation of hearers.

Application. — The Scriptures are replete with passages earnestly enjoining this very duty upon Christian ministers. In view of prevalent indifference with regard to doctrinal differences this duty becomes all the more imperative. Faithful performance of it may not make for popularity. Nevertheless it is a divine requisite of a good minister and faithful shepherd of the flock.

3

A) "Godliness" is piety toward God, a complete, cheerful, happy conformity with, and submission to, the will of God in faith and love.

B) "Exercise thyself." As the Greek athletes put forth great effort in training to become physically fit to win in their ancient contests, so the good minister of Jesus Christ (and every Christian) must strive for godliness, not only when this is a comparatively easy, convenient matter but also when this requires real effort, self-denial, loss of popularity, etc., v. 10 a.

C) Godliness is worth this effort, v. 8. Emphasize this over and against the false notion that godliness is a handicap for success in this life. Joseph, Daniel, modern examples. Above all, godliness has God's promise of the life which is to come. That is paramount. Matt. 16, 26. Hence exercising unto godliness is far more important than any bodily exercise, which promotes merely physical well-being.

D) Comfort in such striving, v. 10. The living God can, and according to his promise will, give to the striving good minister the crown of life. As God is the Savior of all men, His gracious will is actually and fully achieved in them that believe and accept. John 3, 16; 1 Tim. 2, 4; Matt. 10, 22; 2 Tim. 4, 8.

4

A) The divine truths, which by personal faith he believes, the good minister of Jesus Christ must teach others in all truth and purity, v. 11. By the Gospel-truths he must show his hearers the way to salvation. A good minister must never lose sight of his objective.

B) The good minister must also "command." As a good shepherd he must lead his flock. The divine authority of the Word should be recognized by both pastor and hearers. 1 Tim. 6, 17, "charge." Heb. 13, 17, "obey."

Conclusion. — V. 16. What an inducement for both pastors and hearers!

AUG. F. BERNTHAL

Reformation Festival

1 COR. 3, 11—23

The Church is a temple under construction. The Sanballats are plotting to hinder the progress of building. Thus it was at Corinth, likewise in the age of the Reformation, and thus it is today. The temple will be completed. In the building of this temple we are to be laborers together with God, 1 Cor. 3, 9. The apostle gives each of us indispensable directions on

Building the Temple

He calls attention to

1. The temple that is under construction
2. The foundation on which the temple is erected
3. The materials that are to be used

1

Some of the most magnificent buildings in the world are temples and cathedrals. Solomon's Temple. The second Temple, as beautified by Herod, awed the disciples, Mark 13, 1. 2. Greek and Gothic architecture still awe us with their grandeur and beauty. "Ye are the temple of God," v. 16. The word employed by the apostle is not ἱερόν, but ναός, "used of the Temple at Jerusalem, but only of the sacred edifice (or sanctuary) itself, consisting of the Holy Place and the Holy of Holies." (Thayer.) Ye are the temple of God, vv. 16. 17. As the glory of the Lord filled the Tabernacle, Ex. 40, 35, and Solomon's Temple, 2 Chron. 5, 1. 2, so the Spirit of God dwells in you; cp. Eph. 2, 20 ff.; 2 Cor. 6, 16. "Know ye not?" (Text.) This fact is to be understood and appreciated. False conception in Luther's age of clergy and laity. The Church is not confined to the hierarchy, the Pope, priests, canonized saints, etc.; it is the communion of the saints, the whole number of believers.

Being members of this communion, we are not standing on the side-line and admiring the beauty of the temple; we are essential parts, living stones, within this temple, 1 Pet. 2, 5. 9. What a great distinction!

This temple is holy; sanctified, cleansed, by the blood of Christ, v. 17; Eph. 5, 25—27. Over that temple the Lord Himself stands guard, Is. 27, 3; Zech. 2, 8; Ps. 46. God utters the terrible threat: v. 17 a. Let us not by envy and strife and divisions, v. 3, by insistence on our own views and opinions, by false doctrine, destroy the temple of God, the Church of Christ. Woe to the Sanballats! Neh. 6.

2

Another very important consideration in building a temple is the foundation. The cathedral often calls forth admiration, but the foundation, hid in the earth, is forgotten. A foolish man builds his house on sand, the wise man on a rock. Ead's Bridge at St. Louis rests on solid masonry, sunk seventy feet below the river, and bed-rock.

What is the foundation on which God's temple is built? On what rock do you base your faith, your religion? On Peter? on human deeds and works of the Law? on the Golden Rule?

on the traditions, resolutions of councils and synods? That is the Corinthian mistake to base one's religion on Peter, Paul, Apollos, or on human wisdom and Greek philosophy, v. 22 and 1 ff.

V. 11: "Other foundation can no man lay . . . Christ." The question of foundation is settled once and for all time. Jesus, the God-man, the Savior, our Prophet, Priest, and King, with His Word and His merit, is the one and only Foundation. Appeal to build faith on Jesus only and to follow the pattern of this foundation in holiness of life, Is. 28, 16; Matt. 7, 24; 16, 16—18.

3

The material that we use in building God's temple should be carefully selected, v. 12 ff. Two kinds of building material are mentioned, the one: "gold, silver, precious stones"; the other: "wood, hay, stubble." The material must be most durable and substantial since the building will be put to a severe test. There will come a "day" of testing, of revealing, v. 13. That day will not dawn like a spring morning, with budding blossoms and songs of birds. The horizon on that day of trial will be ablaze with fire. It is not the fire of an imaginary purgatory, but Judgment Day fire, 2 Thess. 1, 8; 2 Pet. 3, 7. 10. 12. On that day the wood, hay, and stubble will be burned, and the temple into whose construction such material has gone will be in danger of collapsing.

The Corinthians were in danger of mixing the wood, hay, and stubble of Greek wisdom, party spirit, admiration of men, a loose morality, etc., in building the temple, v. 18 ff. The Christians of Luther's day were offered the perishable material of tradition, resolution of councils, worship of saints, indulgences, work-righteousness. Today the combustible stubble and religious rubbish of gaudy hypotheses, the blatant heresies of Modernism and of religious cranks is being dumped on our building site. Beware! Heaven and earth shall pass away, and all the pretensions, fallacies, and heresies will be exposed as such. The Word of God alone will abide forever. The solid, imperishable Word of the living God is the only material we should and must employ. That is the material the "wise master builder," v. 10, St. Paul, used. Luther.

You have the high prerogative of being God's coworker in building His temple, His holy Church. Use, then, the right material, the living Word of God. — Close with an admonition to oppose false doctrine in every form, because error never builds, but always destroys, the Church. Remain loyal to God's Word and Luther's doctrine pure. H. W. Bartels

Theological Observer — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

I. Amerika

Etwas über die alten Intersynodalen Verhandlungen; auch über das intuitu fidei. — Der Nekrolog D. C. C. Heins, der in der Julinummer der „Theologischen Quartalschrift" erschienen ist, erwähnt diese beiden Gegenstände; veranlaßt uns, diesen Nachruf hier abzudrucken: „. . . . Es war besonders ein Übelstand der Kirche, der dem Entschlafenen zu Herzen ging und an dessen Hebung er mit Aufbietung aller seiner Kräfte arbeitete. Das ist die Zerrissenheit und Zersplitterung zumal der lutherischen Kirche in unserm Lande. Dabei war D. Hein allem Unionismus feind, der, wie er sich ausdrückte, eine Einigkeit vorspiegelt, wo doch keine besteht. Auf den Versammlungen des Intersynodalen Komitees, das zur Veröffentlichung der sogenannten Chicagoer Thesen führte, war es gerade D. Hein, der oft vor allzu schneller Annahme irgendeiner der vorgelegten Thesen warnte, weil sie möglicherweise trotz anscheinender Übereinstimmung doch vielleicht nicht von allen Komiteegliedern in gleichem Sinne verstanden werde. Es war D. Hein, der auf dem zweiten Lutherischen Weltkonvent die unpopuläre Lehre von der Verbalinspiration vortrug. Wiederum war es D. Hein, der die Bildung der Amerikanisch-Lutherischen Kirche, an deren Zustandekommen ihm doch sehr viel lag, nach Kräften verzögern half und nicht eher in den Zusammenschluß seiner Synode, der früheren Ohiosynode, mit den Synoden von Buffalo und Iowa einwilligte, bis die auftauchende Unklarheit in eben der Inspirationslehre behoben war. Wiederum war es D. Hein, der, von seiner Synode zur Begrüßung der Vereinigten Lutherischen Kirche Amerikas nach Savannah gesandt, sich nicht scheute, in freundlicher, aber doch unmißverständlicher Weise der V. L. K. A. ihre unlutherische Praxis in wesentlichen Stücken als Haupthindernis der erstrebten Einigung vorzuhalten. Dies muß anerkannt werden, wenn man auch die Tatsache, daß er sich zum Gang nach Savannah bereit fand, als einen Fehlschritt bedauern mag. Sein Zeugnis wäre kräftiger gewesen, wenn er es nicht nur in Worten abgelegt, sondern auch durch die Tat des Fernbleibens unterstrichen hätte. . . .

„Nachtrag. Vorstehendem fügen wir noch einen Passus aus dem inzwischen in der ‚Kirchlichen Zeitschrift' (Juni 1937) erschienenen Nachruf D. Reus hinzu: ‚In dem Prädestinationsstreit hatte sich die Ohiosynode mit andern — auch Iowa — zu einseitig auf die praedestinatio intuitu fidei festgelegt. Wer die damalige Situation kennt, versteht das und kann es konstatieren, ohne damit über die damals leitenden Männer ein unfreundliches Urteil abgeben zu wollen. Es war die Theorie der Dogmatiker des 17. Jahrhunderts gewesen, und die wollte man nicht ohne weiteres als unlutherisch gebrandmarkt sehen. Ich weiß nicht, wann D. Hein zu der Erkenntnis durchdrang, daß die Annahme einer praedestinatio intuitu fidei nicht Schriftlehre, sondern menschliche Konstruktion ist; aber es war erfreulich, zu sehen, wie er in den intersynodalen Verhandlungen wohl dafür eintrat, in welch einem Sinn allein das intuitu fidei nicht schriftwidrig ist, dann aber entschieden betonte, daß das, was Schrift und Bekenntnis Erwählung oder Prädestination nennen, nichts mit dem intuitu fidei zu tun hat.' Diese Erklärung, in der offensichtlich jedes Wort sehr sorgsam abgewogen ist, verdient allgemeine Be-

achtung. Die hier desavouierte Intuituslehre war es, die seinerzeit die Synodalkonferenz spaltete. Die Verantwortung für den unheilvollen Riß in der lutherischen Kirche Amerikas trifft demnach nicht die Bekämpfer dieser von Menschen konstruierten Lehre. Sie traten für die Wahrheit der Schrift ein. M." E.

Reporting on the Meeting of the Augustana Synod in Omaha, June 14—20, the *Journal of the American Lutheran Conference*, August, 1937, p. 60, says: "Far-reaching in its effect upon the Augustana Synod's relations with other Lutheran church-bodies was the recommendation regarding unionism and the Galesburg Rule — 'Lutheran pulpits for Lutheran pastors only and Lutheran altars for Lutheran communicants only' — now known as the 'Minneapolis Theses.' 'Some of the pastors and churches of the Augustana Synod have given offense and have compromised their synod in the eyes of fellow-Lutherans by their loose practises in regard to secretism or unionism,' reported Dr. Bersell. Approval was given the 'Minneapolis Theses' when the synod resolved that . . . 'we are distressed to learn of the disregard by some pastors of the so-called Minneapolis Theses and urge our pastors not to compromise this covenant.'" E.

Episcopalian Confusion Concerning Marriage. — That one extreme begets another is confirmed by the present attitude of a number of Episcopalians who, horrified by the looseness and laxity which is in vogue concerning divorces, are discussing the question whether it is ever right for the Church to sanction the marriage of people that have been divorced. Fifteen clergymen have drawn up, and signed, a statement which they on April 17 mailed to the "160 bishops and 6,200 priests" of their Church. The statement reads as follows:

"(1) We firmly believe that for Christian people marriage after divorce is contrary to the law of our Lord Jesus Christ as declared in the gospels and revealed by guidance of the Holy Ghost during the long life of the Church. We recognize that some scholars think that this prohibition does not apply to the innocent party in a divorce secured on grounds of adultery, and, this matter being doubtful, we admit that there may be a legitimate question about the right of the Church to bless remarriage in such cases, but in no others.

"(2) We deny that any authority in the Anglican communion has power to change, by canon law or otherwise, the teaching on this matter as given by the Lord for the governance of Christians.

"(3) We are sure that the passage of canons which in any way modify for Christians the divine law in respect to marriage after divorce will result in the raising of grave doubt, in the minds of many, about the faithfulness of the Anglican communion to its divine Master, and this to the grave injury of the cause of Christ.

"(4) We request that concerning the solemnization of marriage after divorce only such action be taken as will insure strict obedience, by all who share communion in our Church, to the standard laid down by Jesus Christ Himself."

Commenting on this statement, the *Living Church* says: "The Anglican Church, in the providence of God, has so far maintained the

highest standard of any religious body in regard to Christian marriage. In some parts of the Anglican Church remarriage after divorce is not permitted for any reason. Our own Church recognizes the exceptive clause and permits remarriage to the innocent party after a divorce for adultery, though it does not require its clergy to solemnize such a marriage. Moreover, legitimate grounds for annulment are recognized, and the proper discretion is given to a bishop or ecclesiastical court in such cases. Finally, strict justice is tempered by mercy in the provision that 'any persons who have been married by civil authority or otherwise than as this Church provides may apply to the bishop or to the ecclesiastical court of their domicile for the recognition of communicant status or for the right to apply for Holy Baptism or confirmation.' The marriage law of our Church is not ideal, but it does maintain the Christian marriage standard. If it needs any amendment at all, it is in the direction of greater strictness rather than greater laxity in upholding that standard. Christian marriage is the lifelong, indissoluble union of a baptized man and of a baptized woman. Once consummated, that union cannot be severed except by death. In 'hard cases' it may be necessary for husband and wife to live separately, and in extreme cases Christians may properly apply to the civil courts for divorce. Nevertheless, even after divorce they are still, in the eyes of God and the teaching of the Church, man and wife. No amount of civil or ecclesiastical legislation can change that simple fact."

Here truth and error are thoroughly mixed. There is no doubt that Christ spoke the exceptive clauses in question. There is no doubt furthermore that the innocent party involved in a divorce on account of adultery may remarry. Finally, there is no doubt that the Bible acknowledges malicious desertion as a just cause for divorce. A.

Child Labor Amendment. — As we all know, strenuous efforts are being made at present to secure the approval of sufficient State Legislatures to incorporate the so-called Child Labor Amendment in the Constitution of the United States. From the *Presbyterian Guardian*, which published a long article on this subject, we take over the statements that appear most significant to us: —

"That amendment has often been called the Child Labor Amendment, and its advocacy has sometimes been carried on under the guise of humanitarianism, as though the amendment were just intended to prevent sweat-shop conditions or the like. As a matter of fact, it is just about as heartless a measure as anything that could possibly be conceived. It provides that 'the Congress shall have power to limit, regulate, and prohibit the labor of persons under eighteen years of age." "Some people have a sort of notion that the amendment merely refers to gainful employment, but that is not at all the case. The word 'labor' was expressly insisted on in the wording of the amendment as over against the word 'employment.' A large number of other changes intended to reduce the powers given to Congress to some sort of rational limits are also voted down according to the wishes of the radical elements that determined the wording. The amendment gives to any officials whom Congress may choose to appoint power to enter into the homes

of the people and to regulate or prevent altogether those home activities of children and youth without which there can be no normal development of family life.

"The amendment does not merely give to Congress powers now possessed by State Legislatures. If indeed it did merely do that, it would certainly be bad enough. It would even then be the most extreme instance yet observed of that centralization of power which is such a menace to the life of our country; but as a matter of fact it does far more than that. No State Legislature, it is safe to say, now possesses, under the Constitution of the State (to say nothing of the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States), power to prohibit altogether the labor of persons under eighteen years of age. Yet that is exactly the power that this amendment gives to Congress. . . . And it may well be held to have the effect of repealing any guarantees of liberty now in the Constitution which will conflict with it. That being so, this movement will practically wipe out the rights of the forty-five million persons under eighteen years of age in this country and the rights of their parents, so far as those persons are concerned. It will place those forty-five million persons under the despotic control of Government officials.

"Some people say that Congress can be trusted not to make unwise use of those powers. But we are really amazed when people advance any such argument as that. In the first place, the reposing of such implicit trust in the legislative branch of our Government is contrary to the heart and core of our Constitution. Our Constitution seeks to safeguard liberty by a system of careful checks and balances between the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. That balance is completely destroyed by this amendment. In the second place, Congress plainly cannot be trusted not to make unwise use of powers like those which are given today by this amendment. The events of recent years have shown that only too clearly. Just let a time of depression come, and just let casual majorities in Congress be unchecked by constitutional inhibitions, and just let the enemies of our free institutions fish in troubled waters, as they have done with such success during the present depression, and we shall see very soon how much Congress can be trusted. . . .

"As for the bearing of all this upon Christian education in the home as well as in the school, surely not many words are needed to point that out. Anything that attacks the family, as this amendment does, attacks the Christian religion. Small likelihood will there be, if this amendment is ratified, that the advocates of Christian education in this country will very long remain unmolested. The step is not a very long one from the ratification of this amendment to the compulsory youth movement of Hitler or the comprehensive slavery of the Soviet system."

The writer in the *Guardian* relates the history of the amendment, pointing out that it was approved by Congress and sent to the States in 1924. Since discussions showed that the measure was of a radical nature, up to 1931 only six States had ratified it, while thirty-eight Legislatures, after consideration in either one or both houses, had rejected it. In the period of the depression its proponents again became very active, and at the time when the *Guardian* article was written, twenty-four States had

given their approval. Twelve more were then needed for adoption into the Constitution.

From the *Presbyterian* we reprint parts of a letter which appeared in the *New York Times* against the amendment. The writer of the letter, James Emery Brooks of Glen Ridge, N. J., says: "Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler has written a splendid letter to the governors of the nineteen States where legislatures are in session, opposing the proposed Child Labor Amendment. Instead of realizing the convincing force of Dr. Butler's statements, some of those favoring the amendment rushed into print to abuse Dr. Butler. . . . If this amendment should be ratified, the women of this country will be to blame for it. . . . They fail to see the sinister nature of the remedy they are favoring. They would not part with one thousand dollars for a piece of real estate without having the title examined, but they are willing to part with the rights, liberties, and happiness of forty-two million young people in this country without paying any attention to the opinions of the ablest members of the American Bar Association, who have examined the title of this amendment and have found it defective. They should be at least as careful of their children as they are of their money. . . . If adopted, this amendment would create a condition far worse than now exists, or ever did exist, in the days when child labor really was a problem. Very few of the people who favor the amendment are actuated by an ulterior motive. Most of them believe they are doing right. May they open their eyes and their ears before it is too late!"

The *Presbyterian* then gives the resolution of the American Bar Association, adopted at its annual meeting August 30, 1933, with respect to this measure: "Resolved by the American Bar Association that the proposed Child Labor Amendment to the Constitution of the United States should be actively opposed as an unwarranted invasion by the Federal Government of a field in which the rights of the individual States and of the family are and should remain paramount. It should also be based on the ground that the Constitution should not be encumbered by prohibitory legislation. We maintain that notwithstanding difficulties encountered in the control of child-labor products in interstate commerce, the cure for the admitted evil must be sought through State legislation, in connection with which the attention of the public should be drawn to the uniform Child Labor Act approved by this association in 1930."

We ought to add that in the "Open Letters Column" of the *Lutheran* a vigorous rejoinder to the article printed in the *Presbyterian Guardian* appeared, in which the many organizations that favor the Child Labor Amendment are enumerated. The writer of the letter holds that the wording of the amendment is proof that the fears voiced in the *Presbyterian Guardian* are unfounded. A.

Brief Items. — At the Southern Baptist convention, held in New Orleans in May, the president of the organization, reelected to head it again, Dr. John R. Sampey of the Louisville Theological Seminary, issued a warning against participation in union movements, which, he averred, are embarrassing to Baptists because of their aversion to "proxy religion," that is, the violation of the principle of "the competency of the individual

to do business with God through Christ alone." Nevertheless he urged that the Baptists be represented in Oxford and Edinburgh this summer. This branch of the Baptist Church reports that in its foreign service it has 415 missionaries, 944 ordained native and 1,437 unordained native workers. It no longer appoints as missionaries people who are not graduates of a standard college and seminary.

What marvelous depths Roman Catholic theological argumentation can reach may be seen from this paragraph cited by the *Presbyterian* from a Belgium paper: "We believers ought to listen when the animals speak to us in the name of God. When cocks crow and the hens cackle, when the sheep bleat and the cows low, when the birds sing, they are simply calling out to us, who are created for eternity, 'Do not eat me on Fridays! Do not eat me on other fast-days!' Do we understand their language?"

The cause of unionism was furnished much water for its mill by the action of the Archbishop of Canterbury, spoken of thus by Canon Anson Phelps Stokes of the Washington Cathedral, Washington, D. C.: "I am convinced that the spirit of the Oxford Conference, which had its climax in the final Communion service, in which, with the approval of the Archbishop of Canterbury, all baptized communicants were invited, represented the essential unity of Christian churches in a most impressive way." The *Presbyterian* finds a fly in the ointment because no "non-episcopally ordained delegate" was asked by the archbishop to assist him in this Communion service. Thinking of the course of the archbishop who communes with non-Anglicans but refuses to let one of their pastors assist him, one is reminded of the "blind guides which strain at a gnat and swallow a camel."

A writer in the *Presbyterian* says: "Professor Virgilius Ferm, Professor of Philosophy in the College of Wooster, O., has recently issued a book entitled *First Chapters in Religious Philosophy*. The book has been reviewed by Joseph D. Ryan in the columns of the *Prebyterian* and by Prof. D. M. Allan, Ph. D., in the *Union Seminary Review*, Richmond, Va. Both reviewers agree that the author is an extreme Liberal. One reviewer does not recommend it to the general or evangelical reader. The other concludes that the author's theism is substantial, but his Christianity tenuous. The subjects treated are: God, Values, Good and Evil, Soul and Body, Human Freedom, Prayer, and Immortality. The evolutionary science and modern critical scholarship are accepted as verities not needing present proof." Not having read the book of Dr. Ferm, we are not in a position to say whether the above unfavorable judgment is justified or not. Since Dr. Ferm, according to the *Lutheran World Almanac* of 1933, is a ministerial member of the Augustana Synod, the allegations of the critic quoted take on special significance and should be investigated by the proper authorities.

When, as an exchange relates, the Unitarian congregation Church of Our Father in Portland asked to be admitted to membership in the Portland Council of Churches, many Christian people saw in this a challenge and vigorously opposed the granting of the request. Some of them stated that, if the Unitarians were admitted, seventy-five per cent. of the other

churches would withdraw from the Council. The Unitarians then resolved to revoke their application. But now the liberal elements in the churches are bestirring themselves and demand the Unitarians should be invited to become members. A struggle between the would-be Bible Christians and the Liberals lies ahead, which, if it comes, may be the very best thing that could happen to the Portland Council of Churches.

How Dr. Bersell of the Augustana Synod thinks some of the difficulties of church-work should be removed he expressed in the following paragraph of his address to his synod:

"These points are important in my judgment: 1. That the matter of recommending ministerial candidates to a vacant congregation be left exclusively to duly constituted synodical or conference officers or boards; 2. that authority be vested in some official or group of officials of synod or conference to adjust 'maladjustments' in the relationship of pastors and congregations; 3. that it be made easier for older pastors to get a call to a church by means of the option of an automatic termination to the permanent call at a satisfactory retirement age." If all congregations voluntarily accept such an arrangement and abide by it, very well. It cannot be imposed on them *iure divino*.

In Albany, N. Y., where for the last twelve years schoolchildren had been released one hour every week for religious instruction, objection has suddenly been raised to this plan. The State Commissioner of Education has ruled that only one half hour a week can be granted. The trouble was caused by the inability of Roman Catholics and Protestants to agree on the particular hour which was to be set aside for this purpose.

The mother of Joseph Stalin, Russian dictator, attended church last Easter. In commenting on this action Stalin explained that she had been brought up in an age when the church seemed a necessity, but she would not be permitted to do so again. Furthermore, she would not be permitted to use the name Stalin again. Her name should be that of her husband, Schugaschwilli. A short time later, on June 4, she died.

N. L. C. B.

Speaking to a class in Godlessness at Leningrad, Professor Schukowski declared that in the event of a European war the Russian communistic youth would march out in a war against Christianity, and the red flag of Communism should be hoisted over the cathedrals of St. Peter in Rome, Notre Dame in Paris, and Westminster Abbey in London. These great buildings would then be turned into atheistic museums like the old cathedral at Leningrad. — *N. L. C. B.*

The *Religious Telescope* tells of 433 higher-ranking students of an unusually superior high school near Philadelphia who were recently without warning asked to write out the Lord's Prayer, which has for many years been repeated every morning in that school. Forty-eight per cent. wrote it correctly. The other fifty-two per cent. produced amazing versions and variations, such as: "I will be done." "God will be done." "Give us no trespasses." "Deliver us from salvation." "Forgive us this day our daily bread." — *N. L. C. B.*

A pastor whose congregation banned church suppers and who in the *Christian Century* describes the immense progress which his church

made when it began to rely entirely on direct contributions, says that the committee which had been appointed to study the situation the church was in prior to adoption of the new course found "that only thirty per cent. of the members of this church were recognizing the obligations of their membership. We soon learned that this is a universal situation. What of the other seventy per cent.? What has the church been doing about them? What should the church do about them? What is possible for the church to do about them?" Following the recommendation of the committee, the congregation decided to get in touch with all the church-members for pledges. "At no time since the plan was adopted has there been less than eighty per cent. of the budget pledged nor less than seventy-five per cent. of the members pledging."

Southern Presbyterians, in convention assembled at Montreat, N. C., in May, heard a committee propose that these words of the Confession of Faith (Westminster) be omitted: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life and others foreordained to everlasting death. These angels and men, thus predestinated or foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be either increased or diminished." The various presbyteries will have to vote on the question whether this motion is to prevail or not.

To our surprise Prof. W. Harvey-Jellie of the Presbyterian College at Montreal, Canada, maintains, in a series of articles on Calvin, that the doctrine of a double election was not taught by Calvin himself, but by overzealous disciples. He says, after having sketched the spread of Calvinism: "But meantime the attitude of the lay public became less sympathetic towards the stern aspects of the doctrine of predestination and divine election. Hyper-Calvinism, with its specious claim to be the logical result of the Genevan doctrine, was rendering the teaching of Calvin repellent to the simple believer by supplementing the reformer's statement of an election to salvation by the stern doctrine of a complementary election to damnation. The bald presentation of such a tenet almost inevitably awakened a popular revulsion, and there arose an extreme repugnance to a theological system which could generate so dark a proposition. It must no doubt be admitted that we have here reached a mystery which defies the mind of man to penetrate. It is the ancient dilemma of the relation between free will and determinism, which neither philosophy nor theology is capable of illuminating." That Calvin taught the doctrine here rejected can be seen from the quotations submitted in Fischer's *History of Doctrine*, in particular when he points to *Inst.* III, 21, 7.

In an argument, a few years ago, over the New Testament a newspaper reporter advised a young Jewish lawyer, Hyman Appelman, to learn more about that book before he tried to discuss it. Appelman took the advice, and as a result became a Christian. Already well educated, he is now approaching graduation from a Baptist seminary.

The Presbyterian

A report on Presbyterian mission-work in Korea says: "Presbyterians North and South do a major share of the Christian work in that

country, and much of their work has been educational. A truly great system of schools has been in operation for some years, but most of that system will disappear now because schools are being required to attend the shrines, and rather than bow at a heathen shrine we will simply close our schools." It will be remembered that Korea is under the dominion of Japan.

"The divinity school, especially if it is associated with a university, is confronted with a very practical question. Does it want its professors to maintain an attitude of academic calm and scientific disinterestedness under all conditions, so that their respectability in the eyes of their university colleagues may not be compromised? Or does it want them to be deeply concerned about remedying the conditions which their professional studies find to be wrong? Is the main object of a divinity school the advancement of pure scholarship in the fields of the theological sciences? Or is it the education of men who will both understand the nature of religion and be energized by a strong determination to make it effective for the salvation of individuals and society?" So writes the editor of the *Christian Century*, criticizing the dismissal of Prof. Jerome Davis in the divinity school of Yale because of insufficient scholarship. It is interesting to note that unwittingly Dr. Morrison champions the Lutheran view of theology as a *habitus practicus*. A.

Deaths. — The U. L. C. A. lost one of its prominent leaders when Dr. John A. W. Haas, president emeritus of Muhlenberg College in Allentown, Pa., died, Thursday, July 22, seventy-four years old. Dr. Haas, author of a number of books and pamphlets, was a conservative theologian. With respect to the Scriptures, however, he, too, was unwilling to defend the absolute inerrancy of the Bible.

In Germany Dr. Wilhelm Zoellner, who from 1935 till last January served as chairman of the Reich Church Commission, died July 17, seventy-seven years old. For twenty years he had been general superintendent of the Protestant District of Westphalia.

On July 8 Dr. C. J. Bengston, who for almost twenty years served as editor of the *Lutheran Companion* (Augustana Synod), departed this life. A.

National Lutheran Radio Week. — "Preach the Gospel to every creature," Mark 16, 15. In harmony with this majestic command, given the Church by the risen Christ, the Synodical Radio Committee last year called into being National Lutheran Radio Week, a very successful venture. The Reformation Week, October 31 to November 6, has been designated as N. L. R. W. for 1937. The purpose? *The inauguration of Lutheran broadcasts in every locality where a radio station is available, daily, or as often as possible, during this one week, preferably throughout the year.* Inasmuch as station managers generally make their plans early, contacts with them and preparations for the programs should be made as soon as possible.

Through the instrumentality of the American Lutheran Publicity Bureau negotiations are pending with the National Broadcasting Company, the Columbia Broadcasting System, and the Mutual Broadcasting System to secure time on the major chains for Lutheran Week.

Rev. G. Christian Barth, Cincinnati, O., member of Synod's Board of Directors, will sponsor a globe-encircling sacred Lutheran DX (distance) program over WLW, 700 k. c., 500,000 watts, namely, during the night of Thursday, November 4, and the morning of Friday, November 5, 2—2.30 A. M., E. S. T.; 1—1.30 A. M., C. S. T.; 12—12.30 A. M., M. S. T.; 11—11.30 P. M., P. S. T. The speaker will be Dr. J. W. Behnken, President of the Missouri Synod. The program will also be broadcast over WLW's short-wave station W8XAL. Tune in; tell others; and write Pastor Barth, c/o WLW, Cincinnati, O., U. S. A., after the program.

"Their line is gone out through all the earth and their words to the end of the world." Ps. 19, 4.

HERMAN H. HOHENSTEIN
Secretary of Synodical Radio Committee

II. Ausland

Das Hebräische an den höheren Lehranstalten in Bayern. Wie aus einer Mitteilung in der „Allgemeinen Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirchenzeitung" hervorgeht, hat letzten Winter das Staatsministerium die Aufhebung des hebräischen Wahlunterrichts an den höheren Lehranstalten in Bayern verfügt. Daraufhin hat der dortige evangelisch-lutherische Landeskirchenrat, dessen Vorsitzer Bischof Meiser ist, eine Bitte an das Staatsministerium für Unterricht und Kultus gerichtet, woraus wir einige Sätze hier abdrucken:

„Durch diese Maßnahme wird die wissenschaftliche Ausbildung des Pfarrernachwuchses, auf die auch der Staat bisher großen Wert gelegt hat, ganz außerordentlich erschwert. Die Kirche kann nicht darauf verzichten, von ihren Dienern eine gründliche, auch wissenschaftlich-sprachliche, Kenntnis des Alten Testaments zu fordern. Denn sie ist die Verkünderin einer geschichtlichen Religion. Der HErr der Kirche ist als Glied eines bestimmten Volkes in die Welt eingetreten. . . . Daraus ergibt sich auch, daß die künftigen Diener der Kirche imstande sein müssen, das Alte Testament sprachlich richtig zu erfassen. Die Erwerbung der hierzu nötigen Kenntnisse kann aber nicht ohne großen Schaden erst der Universität zugewiesen werden. Die Zeit des Theologiestudiums ist durch die Notwendigkeiten des Arbeitsdienstes, der Wehrpflicht an der nationalpolitischen Erziehung ohnehin schon viel stärker als früher beschränkt, während der Umfang desselben ganz erheblich gewachsen ist. Kann der Theolog künftig erst auf der Universität mit dem Hebräischen beginnen, so geht ihm notwendigste kostbare Zeit fürs Studium verloren. Er ist auch erst nach ein paar Jahren so weit, daß er sich wissenschaftlich mit dem Alten Testament beschäftigen kann. Die deutsche evangelische Theologie hatte — nicht zuletzt durch ihre gründliche sprachliche Schulung — bis heute die führende Stellung im Weltprotestantismus. Diese Führerstellung wird bedroht, wenn der deutsche Theolog künftig nicht mehr die Zeit hat, dem Studium der Theologie gründlich obzuliegen. Es würde auch im evangelischen Ausland zweifellos sehr Aufsehen erregen, wenn die Anforderungen an die sprachliche Ausbildung der deutschen Theologen, die den Ruhm der deutschen Theologie mit begründet haben, von der Kirche bedeutend herabgesetzt werden müßten. Unsere höheren Schulen haben von jeher ihre Ehre darein gesetzt, dem künftigen Studenten neben der allgemeinen Bildung auch noch besondere, für sein Einzelstudium notwendige Kenntnisse auf dem Wege des Wahlunterrichts zu vermitteln. Wie für das Studium

in andern Fakultäten, geschieht das auch seit alters für das Studium der Theologie durch den hebräischen Wahlunterricht der höheren Schulen. Es wäre eine Ausnahme, die sehr bittere Empfindungen wecken würde, wenn jetzt in Bayern nur den künftigen Theologen diese Möglichkeit der Vorbereitung aufs Hochschulstudium genommen würde." E.

The Oxford Conference. — It will be difficult fully to evaluate the discussions and resolutions of the Oxford meeting held in July this year, which was supposed to be ecumenical, till complete reports of the proceedings have been published. From an interesting account sent the *Christian Century* by Charles Clayton Morrison, its editor, attending the Conference, we take over some items that appear enlightening. Five subjects, so he says, were made the foci of the deliberations: "Church Unity"; "Church and State"; "Church and Ecumenical Order"; "Church, Community, and State in Relation to Education"; "The Ecumenical Church and the World of Nations." Reading these titles one does not feel surprised to hear Dr. Morrison say that at the conference there was agreement on the thesis that the Church must accept responsibility for the creation of a Christian civilization. While Prof. Emil Brunner, rated as a Barthian, spoke for the "withdrawal of the Church from the field of social action and its concentration upon the saving of souls by the preaching of an individualistic Gospel," Dean W. R. Matthews of St. Paul's, London, immediately followed him with a message of the opposite tenor, and Barthian influence did not thereafter become evident. While Dr. Morrison was a member of the section that had to do with the relation of the Church to the community, he writes: "I am also drawn by my peculiar interests to the section dealing with education, for it is my belief that the modern Church must assume far greater responsibilities for the education of its children than in the past. It was a blunder of magnificent proportions when the Protestant churches complacently committed to the State the education of their children." With reference to the discussions pertaining to "Church and State" he writes: "The Church must find for itself a new apologetic which will both affirm its social responsibility and avoid any dependence upon the State or upon temporal instrumentalities for the discharge of this responsibility. This is the basic problem of the Oxford Conference. It is being solved by an analysis of the relation in which Church, State, and community stand to one another and by affirming at one and the same time the complete independence and autonomy of the Church and its responsilibity for the salvation of man throughout the whole fabric of his social relationships. It thus avoids Calvin's error of claiming superiority for the Church over the State by affirming the sovereignty of God over the State. And it avoids Luther's error of dividing the common life of man into two domains, the inner and the outer (which resulted in the granting of absolute supremacy to the State in the political and social order), by affirming the unity of the inner and the outer life of man and the sovereignty of God over both." It could easily be demonstrated that Morrison does not understand Luther, who by no means wished to make Christianity a plant which was to be segregated in a hot-house, never to be taken into the street and market-place. Witness his plea for Christian schools so that the nation might obtain Christian judges, magistrates, lawyers, teachers, and citizens.

Did the Conference propose to put the quietus on the preaching of the social gospel? Apparently not. Dr. Morrison writes: "How the Church is to discharge its responsibility to gain for God the sovereignty which is His alone has received many practical answers in the discussions and the formal reports of the sections. But the chief answer which is heard as a kind of refrain, recurring again and again, is: By being a Church. If the Church may not retire quietistically into the subjective region of individual piety, neither may it become a kind of state or a political party or any other sort of secular agency, using the instruments of the temporal order for spiritual ends. Its witness is to be borne by the realization of the divine community in its own life and by the carrying of this witness into the social order through the activities of its members, singly and in groups, in the multifarious relationships in which they stand — in the family, the school, the economic order, and the State. But this does not absolve the Church from the obligation to give guidance to its members and directly to the social community in respect of the concrete issues which arise. The Church cannot 'be a Church' in a vacuum. Its very being necessarily involves it in the common life of the community. Moreover, its own community is no other-worldly community, but the revelation of the true community of humanity. It is a sacramental [?] anticipation of the community which God lays for all mankind. The Church's ethics, both for itself and for its members as individuals, springs from this revelation of the divine will. Therefore the Church is responsible evermore to interpret its revelation of the will of God for the reordering of society at those points where the organized system under which men live shows any injustice and to strive for a better social order." If we understand Dr. Morrison correctly, he and the Oxford Conference want the Church to address itself not only to its members, but to the community in general by preaching morality to the unconverted to bring about better conditions. That, of course, is the social gospel.

On the question of pacifism the Conference was and remained divided, some members holding that war never may be participated in by Christians (their spokesman being Canon Charles E. Raven), while others, led by the Archbishop of York, contended that there is "such a thing as a just war and that loyalty to the Christian faith is not violated by a Christian citizen's participation in it."

The Conference seems to have almost unanimously taken the position that "the Church is fully independent of the State, that it must not accept a privileged position at the hands of the State, and cannot yield to the State's dictation."

Whether the doctrine of the vicarious atonement of Christ was acknowledged as being the center of all Christian teaching such reports as have reached us do not say.

All of us see at once, of course, that the Conference was an exponent of unionism, which fact was emphasized in the joint Communion service held at the conclusion.

The state churches of Germany were not officially represented, their government having refused them permission to attend. The Conference sent them a letter which expressed sympathy with them in their present

struggles and voiced the thought that, after all, the Church is one and that, if one member suffers, the others suffer also. Since in this communication the Roman Catholic Church in Germany is alluded to as being subjected to persecution as well as the Protestants, it has been criticized quite freely by German Protestant spokesmen. Besides, there are other features of the Conference which failed to receive the endorsement of some church leaders in Germany. The *Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung* has published an article on the Conference which deserves careful reading. We append here the last part of it.

"Ein Urteil ueber das Gesamtergebnis ist erst moeglich, wenn saemtliche Akten vorliegen. Nur soviel koennen wir schon heute sagen, dass es doch ein grosses Ereignis war, wenn hier das Weltweite des Christentums und des Evangeliums in Erscheinung trat, wenn ferne Brueder sich die Haende reichten und in einer Welt des Unglaubens die Welt des Glaubens einen sichtbaren Ausdruck fand. 'Dass sie alle eins seien', dieses Gebet Christi leuchtete durch diese Weltkirchenkonferenz hindurch. Freilich auch das andere, das wir von Stockholm her kennen, blieb nicht im Hintergrund, das Bestreben und die Hoffnung, die Welt Christus zu unterwerfen. Man muss immer bedenken, dass der Geist des angelsaechsischen Christentums das Wort fuehrte. Es waren doch nicht bloss geistliche Toene, sondern auch irgendwie politische Toene, die da und dort aufklangen. Man moechte die Kirche zu einer Macht bringen, zu einer Weltmacht gegenueber den Maechten der Welt; in diese Linie gehoert auch der Drang nach Organisationen, einer die Welt umfassenden Organisation, durch Einrichtung eines 'Oekumenischen Rates der Kirchen'. Werden sich alle Kirchen von diesem Rat beraten lassen? Wird es nicht zu Schwierigkeiten mit dem Staat fuehren, wenn eine uebernationale 'Organisation' in das Leben der Kirche dareinredet? Hat nicht bereits die 'Botschaft' gezeigt, wie angelsaechsisches Denken sich nicht ueberall mit deutschem Denken deckt? Schon Landesbischof Dr. Ihmels warnte in Stockholm, die Kirche auf das Geleise weltlicher Machtansprueche zu fuehren; er betonte stark: 'Mein Reich ist nicht von dieser Welt.' Und dies Reich wird nicht auf dem Wege menschlicher Organisationen gebaut. So sehr wir es begruessen, wenn die Christen in aller Welt Fuehlung zueinander nehmen, einander staerken, mit ihren Gaben einander dienen, so wuenschen wir doch, dass man sich der Schranken bewusst bleibe, die das Wort Gottes aufzeigt. Die Einheit der Kirche ist Sache des Glaubens, nicht des Schauens; und ihr Bau waechst empor im schlichten Gehorsam gegen das Wort, in Verkuendigung des Evangeliums und im Tragen des Kreuzes. Die Kirche wird nie *ecclesia gloriae* in dieser Welt werden; *ecclesia crucis*, das ist ihr Ruhm, das ist ihre Verheissung."

There is no doubt in our mind that much of what is stated in the above excerpt is true. That the writer, the editor of the *Allgemeine Ev.-Luth. Kirchenzeitung*, Dr. Laible, does not see the unionism involved in the Conference and that he seems to hold that being an Anglo-Saxon necessarily implies doing church-work after the method of the Reformed, if church-work is engaged in at all, instead of merely pointing out that in Anglo-Saxon countries Reformed theology is predominant, are points we note with regret. A.

Book Review — Literatur

The Bible Guide Book. A Companion to Bible Study for Young People and Their Teachers. Arranged by Mary Entwistle. Cokesbury Press, Nashville, Tenn. 236 pages, 5½×8¾. Price, $2.50.

If we could eliminate approximately twenty pages from this book, we should be able to recommend it almost without reservation. For the discussion of the Land of the Bible (peoples, climate and weather, mountains and hills, lakes and rivers, trees and flowers, animal life, wells and springs, cities and villages, roads and travel routes), Life in Palestine in Bible Times (dwellings, occupations, dress, food, games and play, musical instruments, writing-materials, education, etc.), Times and Seasons (springtime, harvests, feasts), Rulers (in the Old Testament, between the Old and the New Testament, in the New Testament, in the Christian era), are, on the whole, very well done, and the illustrations are valuable. But the section on Religion and Religious Leaders must be discounted almost one hundred per cent. because the author is evidently under the domination of evolutionistic, modernistic ideas. The chronological list on page 221 must also be corrected, especially since it places the Pastoral Letters and Second Peter at the end of the century and in 150 A. D., respectively. It is too bad that an otherwise valuable book is spoiled by such aberrations.

P. E. Kretzmann

Trends of Christian Thinking. By Charles S. Macfarland, General Secretary Emeritus of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. Fleming H. Revell Co., New York. 1937. 207 pages, 5½×7¾. Price, $1.50.

A Faith for Today. By Harris Franklin Rall, Professor of Systematic Theology, Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. The Abingdon Press. 284 pages, 5¾×8½. Price, $2.00.

The title of the first book is much too narrow. Dr. Macfarland is examining all sorts of religious or allegedly religious thinking, and being an avowed Liberal (pp. 31. 190), he feels at liberty to designate the unscriptural teachings of the Modernists and the purely naturalistic cogitations of the theologizing philosophers as "Christian" thinking. He discusses these cogitations with much respect and reverence. "Prof. B. E. Meland summarizes worship as living in vital relationship with the best of our environment and that 'which religious language terms God' (note the absence of divine personality, in which he follows H. N. Wieman)." And "happily Meland is both deep and constructive" (pp. 133. 193). His and Wieman's philosophies of religion are "well worthy of the time and thought of every preacher" (p. 9). Prof. Georgia Harkness believes that "the religious consciousness lays three high demands upon men . . .: (1) belief in a God or gods giving man cosmic support, (2) acceptance of moral obligation in human relations as divinely enjoyed, (3) the impulse to worship" (p. 160). "And," says the secretary emeritus of the Federal Council, "it is heartening these days to find professors of philosophy in our colleges giving sympathetic study to religion" (p. 159).

Dr. Macfarland, himself a Modernist, thinks highly of the theology of the Liberals within the Christian Church, the Modernists. Discussing Professor Rall's *A Faith for Today*, he states: "This volume is wholesome, sane, readable. . . . We need just now more teachers who maintain perspective and poise" (p. 165). What, then, does Dr. Rall think of Christ? He accords Christ high praise. He is ready to call Him Lord. He subscribes to the statement that "Jesus stands forth as the supreme discoverer of the laws of power" (p. 196). But he is careful to refrain from calling Him God. What does this leader of the Methodist Church think of the Bible? He rejects as "impossible the old theory of a book verbally inspired and infallible." "You cannot accept the supremacy of Christ and hold to the infallibility of the Bible." "Strictly speaking, not the writings were inspired but the writers." "We cannot say of every word in the Bible that it is the word of God." And so the Bible is "not the final authority for our faith" (chap. XVI). What is the way of salvation according to Dr. Rall's thinking? "Man is made over in that he comes up to a certain standard. This is not a matter of rules to be followed; it is *our higher self waiting to be achieved.*" And how is this achieved? "Follow the example of Jesus: get outside of yourself, share your life with others, find your life in others." "For the Christian, God is Person speaking to person, love and truth claiming the understanding and free loyalty of man" (pp. 159. 183—199). (Modernism, it will be seen, is full-blown Arminianism.) Dr. Rall, like H. E. Fosdick and the others, likes to ridicule the old Christian way of thinking. He will not have God made "a doting grandfather, feeding lollypops to each hungry child, removing stones from its path," nor a "magnified nurse-maid, keeping mankind in perpetual infancy" (pp. 118. 125). The Atonement must not be made "a courtroom affair, a plan by which a debt can be paid or a penalty remitted." "The old preaching was otherworldly. It was narrow, absorbed in some 'scheme' of atonement or plan of salvation by which a man could be forgiven and get to heaven" (pp. 167. 188). If the *sola gratia* is maintained, "salvation will have to be a one-way affair, every step of which is determined by God, and God alone." "Man becomes a helpless pawn in the game that God plays" (pp. 151. 185). And in the estimate of Dr. Macfarland this is "wholesome and sane" thinking, maintaining the Christian perspective and poise. (The *Lutheran* of April 7, by the way, finds it "useful as a way of clearly outlined entrance to the deep things of God.")

To get back to Macfarland's book. *Most* of the writings discussed there as indicating the trend of Christian thinking are written by Liberals and ultra-Liberals. Biblical theology is scantily treated. Our volume therefore is representative only of that part of the external Church which is represented by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America. And it will serve the purpose of showing the state of mind obtaining in the circles dominated or influenced by the liberal theology. These circles are discussing the need of a "new reformation," a "new theology" (pp. 125. 137. 191). The old theology has been discarded. "Of over three hundred contemporary volumes that have been read or have passed under my eyes during the past year there is a conspicuous absence of the subjects of the earlier day, at least in terminology. They are:

the Trinity, the Atonement, Christology, the Incarnation, Miracle, Biblical Inspiration, Eschatology" (p. 197). And this new theology concerns itself, says "Ivan Lee Holt, former president of the Federal Council, with the great ideals of a warless world, a Christian social order, and a united Christendom" (p. 136). The Church, declares Macfarland, "must find its way to unity or be submerged" (p. 146), to a unity, declares John R. Mott, which does "not sink differences," but pools "vital merits" (p. 157). As to the social gospel, many declare that "it has been an illusion and a delusion" (p. 197); but "the champions of social Christianity refuse to abandon the field" (p. 72). Others are looking for help to the theology of Barth (concerning whose book *God in Action* Macfarland says that "it is not ordered thinking," p. 27), to the Oxford Group Movement, the liturgical movement, and other helpers. Macfarland pins his hope on the philosopher. "Perhaps the main trend revealed is the awakening of theology and its need of the philosophic background" (p. 191). "*American Philosophies of Religion,* by Wieman and Meland, which makes clear the 'present need for philosophy of religion,' is well worthy of the time and thought of every preacher" (p. 9).

TH. ENGELDER

Communism. A Deadly Foe to the Christian Faith, Assuming the Guise of Christianity. By John Horsch. Bible Institute Colportage Association, Chicago, Ill. 28 pages, 5¼×7¾. Price, 15 cts. Order from Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

We are more than glad that Mr. Horsch, an outstanding antagonist of Modernism and similar destructive trends of our time, has given us this new pamphlet, showing the prevalence and viciousness of Communism as it seeks to inveigle itself into the favor of American churchmembers under the guise of Christianity. Also this brochure exhibits the excellent graces of Horsch's controversial writings: a clear, entrancing style, careful and accurate thinking, moderation in attacking the opponent, and, above all, constant backing up of all statements by dependable source-proof. If that which John Horsch here writes is true (and there is no reason to assume that it is untrue), then it is high time for us to study more generally also this new insidious snare of Satan now threatening millions in our country in order that we may rightly warn those entrusted to our care. We heartily recommend this new booklet on Communism for careful perusal both to our pastors and our laymen.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

Adolf von Harnack. Von Agnes von Zahn-Harnack. Hans-Bott-Verlag, Berlin-Tempelhof. 1936. 579 Seiten 5½×8½. Preis, kartoniert: RM. 6.50.

Die vorliegende, ziemliches Aufsehen erregende Biographie des bekannten und vielgenannten Gelehrten — er war am 7. Mai 1851 geboren und ist am 10. Juni 1930 gestorben — hat mich aus mehr als e i n e m Grunde so interessiert, daß ich sie vollständig und sorgfältig trotz ihres nicht geringen Umfangs gelesen habe; und doch habe ich schließlich das Buch mit tiefem Bedauern aus der Hand gelegt. Zweimal habe ich Gelegenheit gehabt, Harnack persönlich zu hören und kurz zu sprechen: das erste Mal, als ich in Berlin einer kirchengeschichtlichen Vorlesung von ihm über das Mittelalter beiwohnte, das andere Mal, als er mit Tröltsch, Pfleiderer und

andern hervorragenden Männern der Neuzeit bei der St. Louiser Weltausstellung im Jahre 1904 auf dem Kongreß für Künste und Wissenschaften einen fesselnden Vortrag hielt über die Eingliederung der Kirchengeschichte in die allgemeine Weltgeschichte. Der Eindruck, den man von ihm persönlich und durch das Lesen seiner Schriften gewann, wird durch diese Darstellung seines Lebens und Wirkens verstärkt. Er ist ohne allen Zweifel ein hochbegabter, ganz bedeutender Mann gewesen, und wenn man seine langjährige, vielseitige Tätigkeit überblickt, so kann man sich nur wundern, wie er alles hat bewältigen können. Die Geschichte der Theologie und zum Teil auch der Welt in den vergangenen fünfzig Jahren zieht wie im Fluge an den Augen des Lesers vorüber: seine Lehrtätigkeit an den Universitäten Leipzig, Gießen, Marburg und vierzig Jahre in Berlin, der Streit um das Apostolische Symbolum, der Babel-Bibelstreit über die angebliche Abhängigkeit des Alten Testaments von Babel, das „Wesen des Christentums", das Harnack selbst für sein bestes Werk erklärte, gegen das unter andern auch unser D. Pieper im Jahre 1902 seine schönen, im Synodalbericht und dann besonders gedruckten Vorträge unter demselben Titel richtete, die jetzt auch von D. Müller unter dem Titel *What Is Christianity?* ins Englische übersetzt sind, Harnacks Tätigkeit in der Berliner Akademie der Wissenschaften, einer der bekanntesten gelehrten Vereinigungen der Welt, seine Tätigkeit als Direktor der großen Berliner Bibliothek, als Gründer und Vorsitzer der Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft, als Glied des Reichstags, der Weltkrieg und seine Folgen und anderes. Der Leser verfolgt mit Interesse die Entstehung der vielgenannten Harnackschen Werke: der Dogmengeschichte, in der er die Theologie der Kirche als ein Werk des griechischen Geistes auf dem Boden des Evangeliums hinstellt, der Chronologie des apostolischen Zeitalters, in der er aus wissenschaftlichen Gründen oft zu konservativen Resultaten kommt, der Arbeiten über die Lukasschriften, die er, wieder aus wissenschaftlichen Gründen, im ganzen als echte und zuverlässige verteidigte, über den Erzketzer Marcion, für den er eine besondere Vorliebe hatte, den er als den rechten, eigentlichen Theologen des zweiten Jahrhunderts bezeichnete, über die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums, wo er die Ursprünglichkeit des Taufbefehls in Abrede stellte, und andere mehr. Um so tiefer ist es zu beklagen, daß ein solch reichbegabter, unermüdlich tätiger und einflußreicher Mann nicht der Theologie und der Kirche besser und wirklich gedient hat. Aber auch das Leben und Wirken solcher Personen gehört zur Geschichte, und wer die Geschichte des letzten halben Jahrhunderts recht verstehen will und sich überhaupt für theologische Fragen interessiert, muß sich damit auseinandersetzen. Ich habe mir viele Notizen aus dem Werke gemacht: über Harnacks Vater Theodosius Harnack, den tüchtigen Vertreter der praktischen Theologie in Dorpat und Erlangen, den Verfasser des trefflichen Werkes „Luthers Theologie" (vgl. die Besprechung in „Lehre und Wehre", 74, 373); über seine geistig hochbedeutende Mutter, über sein Studium; über seine Freunde und Schüler, zu denen Leute wie Gregory, Mommsen, Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, Rade, Loofs, Holl, Barth und andere bekannte Gelehrte der Neuzeit gehören; über seine Kollegen, wie Schürer, Stade, Kattenbusch und andere; über seine theologische Abhängigkeit von Albrecht Ritschl und die Trauer, die den frommen Vater wegen der Abweichung des Sohnes von Schrift und Bekenntnis befiel; über sein hervorragendes Lehrgeschick, so daß seine Schüler für ihn begeistert wurden; über seine Vielseitigkeit, so daß er in Berlin auf allen Gebieten weitreichenden Einfluß ausübte und in den Kreisen der Minister und bei dem Kaiser selbst großes Ansehen genoß; über sein Familienleben mit seiner

begabten Gattin Amalie, geb. Thiersch, die, wenn er einmal wegen Krankheit eine Vorlesung im Hause abhielt, hinter der Tür zwischen „Staubwischen und Bratwurstbraten" zuhörte; über seine Tätigkeit auf sozialem Gebiet; aber dann auch über seine ganze moderne Theologie. Er wollte zwar nichts von Religionsgeschichte wissen und erklärte selbst, daß er kein Philosoph sei und sein wolle; aber er leugnete die Jungfrauengeburt und die Auferstehung des Fleisches, bezweifelte das Johannesevangelium und den Epheserbrief, verwarf tatsächlich das Alte Testament, leugnete die Gottheit Christi, bestritt namentlich die Zweinaturenlehre, glaubte keinen persönlichen Teufel, setzte die Hauptsache der Verkündigung JEsu in Gotteserkenntnis und Moral. Dies alles liest man in diesem Werke; aber dabei bringt es so viele interessante Einzelheiten, daß es wirklich ein Beitrag zur neueren Kirchengeschichte ist, freilich vom Harnackschen Standpunkt aus. Immer stieg in mir der Wunsch auf, daß ich doch bestimmte Andeutungen finden möchte, daß seine liberale Theologie nicht die Theologie seines Herzens, sondern nur seines Verstandes gewesen sei. Er hielt Hausandachten; an seinem Geburtstag redete er über das Jakobswort „Ich bin zu geringe aller Barmherzigkeit und aller Treue, die du an deinem Knechte getan hast"; am Tage seiner goldenen Hochzeit über das Schriftwort „Es ist nicht gut, daß der Mensch allein sei". Am Grabe seines Kindes sprach er in Gegenwart seiner andern Kinder den Vers „Schreib meinen Nam'n aufs beste ins Buch des Lebens ein". Er liebte vor andern die Lieder Paul Gerhardts, namentlich „Warum sollt' ich mich denn grämen?" ebenso auch, ganz besonders in seinem Alter, „Jerusalem, du hochgebaute Stadt"; aber es läßt sich auch erkennen, daß er den Inhalt dieses Liedes ganz nach seiner Theologie verstand und daß er die Unsterblichkeit der Seele und die Fortdauer nach dem Tode nicht auf die Schrift, sondern auf Vernunftschlüsse gründete. Von einem Trostspruch aus Gottes Wort auf seinem Sterbelager — er war in seinem hohen Alter noch zu einer Versammlung nach Heidelberg gereist und erkrankte dort — wird nichts erwähnt. Seine Leiche wurde eingeäschert. — Harnack war auch in unserm Lande bekannt. Präsident C. W. Eliot von der Harvard-Universität hat ihm wiederholt eine Professur an dieser Anstalt angetragen, namentlich als er durch den Apostolikumstreit berühmt geworden war. Bei seiner Amerikareise im Jahre 1904 hielt er Vorträge an bekannten Universitäten unsers Landes; er verkehrte brieflich mit Francis Peabody und andern amerikanischen Gelehrten. Er hatte auch ein Auge für die gewaltige wissenschaftliche und industrielle Entwicklung Amerikas, die durch Rockefeller, Carnegie und andere so stark in die Wege geleitet wurde, und förderte deshalb an seinem Teile in der Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft den Aufschwung namentlich der für die Industrie bedeutsamen Wissenschaften. Sogar der deutsche Gesandtschaftsposten in Washington wurde ihm angetragen. Bei der Einweihung des Harnack-Hauses, dem Zentrum der Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gesellschaft, hielt der bekannte damalige amerikanische Botschafter in Berlin Jacob Gould Schurman eine Rede, in der er „Pathos und Humor in unübertrefflicher Weise zu verbinden" verstand. — Noch ein Wort über die Verfasserin der Biographie, Harnacks eigene Tochter, die mit großer Sachkenntnis und warmer Pietät das Leben und Wirken ihres Vaters geschildert und namentlich außerordentlich viele Auszüge aus seinen Briefen und Reden, die sonst nicht zugänglich sind, gemacht hat. Wir hatten wieder gerade bei dem Lesen dieser Biographie den Eindruck, daß, wenn man wirklich einen Mann und seine Zeit genauer kennenlernen will, man besonders auch in seine Briefe blicken muß. Das gilt von Luther, und das gilt auch von Walther. —

Harnacks Zeit und sein Einfluß sind vorübergegangen. Er mußte es selbst erleben, daß der Historismus, die rein geschichtliche Betrachtungsweise — die Geschichtswissenschaft war sein eigentliches Gebiet, mit der er auch die Fragen des Christentums und der Kirche verband — abgetan wurde und daß einer seiner eigenen Schüler, Karl Barth, eine neue Epoche in der Theologie begründet hat. Wie tief er in den Kämpfen seines Lebens und bei dem allmählichen Schwinden seines Einflusses bisweilen getroffen war, zeigt eine handschriftliche Bemerkung in seiner Bibel, als er über Jes. 40, 27—29 die Hausandacht hielt: „Ich weiß vor großer Traurigkeit nicht, wo ich mich hinwende." Ritschl ist vorbei, Harnack ist vorbei, Barth wird vorübergehen, einer nach dem andern, eine Theorie nach der andern; aber die Theologie, die sich fest auf den Fels im Meere, Gottes Wort, gründet, bleibt. L. F.

Marriage in the Lutheran Church. A Historical Investigation. By Gerhard E. Lenski, Ph. D., Pastor of Grace Lutheran Church, Washington, D. C. The Lutheran Book Concern, Columbus, O. 377 pages, 5×7½. Price, $2.50. Order from Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

This book at once makes a favorable impression because it is carefully written and printed in large, inviting type. The description of the work placed on the title-page, "A Historical Investigation," is borne out by the contents. In dwelling on the Lutheran position with respect to marriage, the author expatiates particularly on Luther's attitude and on that of the Lutheran Church in America. The volume will be found interesting and informing, and on account of its excellent documentation and bibliography it possesses a high value for all who wish to engage in independent studies in this field.

In his doctrinal views, which naturally come to the surface, the author will on the whole have the approval of conservative Lutherans. Statements which I have queried are the following: "Whether the so-called innocent party is free to marry is not made clear," namely, in the words of Jesus pertaining to divorce (p. 35); "Luther stands for ending an unsatisfactory marriage rather than for the patient endurance of a wrong" (p. 108), a too sweeping statement; the apparent criticism of Luther (p. 109) for looking upon impotence as a reason for divorce, a criticism which ought first to have investigated whether the impotence which Luther has in mind existed before, or was contracted after, marriage; the questioning of the correctness of the position which declares secret engagements invalid (p. 290); the lament that in the Lutheran Church of America there has not been developed "a social philosophy acceptable to, and influential in, the present order" (p. 319), a lament which, appearing at other places, too, comes dangerously near to being the author's *Leitmotif*. That the Lutheran Church of America, in the sphere of matters pertaining to marriage, has not been the power for good that it should have been is very true; but the same charge can be raised with regard to every other sphere, for instance, the evangelization of the unchurched masses. The reason is not to be sought in the lack of a proper message, but in our human imperfections and weaknesses. W. Arndt

Fourth Lutheran Hour. By Walter A. Maier, Ph. D. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 355 pages, 5¼×7¾. Price, $1.50.

The Lutheran Hour, on a nation-wide hook-up, is by this time an established radio feature. The 90,000 letters received during the fourth Lutheran Hour broadcast are sufficient evidence not only for the fact that the Lutheran Hour has registered with the people of our country, but that many are being blessed by the Gospel-messages which they heard. The Lord, our Savior, does not hold us responsible for converting the world or even one single soul, — that is His own prerogative, — but He has commanded us to *preach the Gospel.* The evident good results of preaching the Gospel by means of the Lutheran Hour puts all those to shame who have little faith in the power of the Gospel. And this very Gospel is so much needed in our day. In one of his addresses of the last series Dr. Maier said: "Before it is too late and Liberalism seizes control of more American pulpits, we should have a determined counter-movement among all conservative Christian groups. Instead of supporting efforts to unite superficially entire church-bodies saturated with this unbelief, Scripturally-minded Christians should consider ways and means of breaking away from denominations where the deity of Christ and His sacrificial redemption are discarded. History shows that, the longer orthodox Christians remain affiliated with Christ-denying groups, the weaker and less effective their protest becomes. The time is here for a new alinement of Christian forces in America." In another address of the last series he said: "Jesus Christ, the same self-giving Savior yesterday, the same loving Redeemer today, the same sin-removing Atonement tomorrow — yes, forever! Can you think of a greater God and a deeper love than our heavenly Father and His holy compassion in giving His own Son, the Sinless for the sin-stained, the Ever-living for the justly damned? Can you picture a more glorious Savior than the Christ who thanked His Father for the privilege of redeeming the world and who in His unchanged love still intercedes for the sinner, the Christ for every man and every day and every place; the Christ for the sick-bed and the death-bed, yet the Christ for the health and strength of life; the Redeemer of the deserted and destitute, yet the Ransom for the applauded and acclaimed? Can you — or any one else — construct a better faith than the changeless Gospel, that has never put a price on its promises or demanded payment for its blessings?" No doubt many who have heard the addresses of the fourth Lutheran Hour will be glad to have them in print. And many others who could not or did not hear them will, we take it, welcome the opportunity of receiving the blessings of these messages. A map of the United States, found on the inside covers of the book, shows the stations that carried the Lutheran Hour.

A few of the subjects treated are herewith given: "Rest for a Restless Age," "The Word — Forever Unbroken," "Building a Better Nation," "Grace without a Question-mark," "Christ Solves the Mystery of Sorrow," "The Changeless Christ for a Changing World," "The Glorious Christ in Every Home," "Power through Prayer," "Christ's Youth Program," "The Resurrection Reality."

J. H. C. Fritz

My Redeemer Liveth. — Ye Shall Be Witnesses. — Streams of Living Water. — Perfect in Every Good Work. Concordia Publishing House. Price: Single copy, 5 cts., postpaid; dozen copies, 48 cts., and postage; 100 copies, $3.00, and postage.

Booklets of 64 pages each, in attractive covers, containing meditations for daily devotions, consisting of a passage to be read from the Bible, a meditation of one page on a topic suggested by the Bible-reading, ending with a question for meditation. Each booklet contains weekly prayers. The period covered by the four booklets extends from Easter Monday to October 9; the authors are the Revs. O. P. Kretzmann, G. Chr. Barth, Walter E. Hohenstein, and Richard R. Caemmerer. — A practical tone prevails in the meditations, the topics presenting the application of the divine Word to the daily life of the Christian. There could be no better way of stimulating the private devotional life of Christians as well as of encouraging the practise of family devotion than to do what many congregations are doing: ordering these booklets for every home in the parish. THEO. HOYER

BOOKS RECEIVED

From the Stockton Press, 516 N. Charles St., Baltimore, Md.:

Snappy Sketches for the Church Blackboard. By Rev. Paul E. Holdcraft, S. T. D. 60 pages, 6×9.

From the Westminster Press, Philadelphia, Pa.:

Toward a Vital Christian Experience. By John A. McAfee. 158 pages, 5×7½.

TO OUR READERS

The Editorial Committee has decided not to publish sermon outlines during the coming year. The sermon studies on the Eisenach Epistle selections will be continued, and a number of outlines for occasional sermons will be published as space permits. The Committee takes liberty to call the attention of the brethren to the *Thomasius Gospel Selections* recently put on the market by Concordia Publishing House and suggests that the brethren choose this splendid selection for the year's preaching and in their preparation make use of the material offered by our Publishing House in its recent publication.

NOTICE TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS

In order to render satisfactory service, we must have our current mailing-list correct. The expense of maintaining this list has been materially increased. Under present regulations we are subject to a "fine" on all parcels mailed to an incorrect address, inasmuch as we must pay 2 cents for every notification sent by the postmaster on a parcel or periodical which is undeliverable because no forwarding address is available or because there has been a change of address. This may seem insignificant, but in view of the fact that we have subscribers getting three or more of our periodicals and considering our large aggregate subscription list, it may readily be seen that it amounts to quite a sum during a year; for the postmaster will address a notification to each individual periodical. Our subscribers can help us by notifying us — one notification (postal card, costing only 1 cent) will take care of the addresses for several publications. We shall be very grateful for your cooperation.

Kindly consult the address label on this paper to ascertain whether your subscription has expired or will soon expire. "Oct 37" on the label means that your subscription has expired. Please pay your agent or the Publisher promptly in order to avoid interruption of service. It takes about two weeks before the address label can show change of address or acknowledgment of remittance.

When paying your subscription, please mention name of publication desired and exact name and address (both old and new, if change of address is requested).

CONCORDIA PUBLISHING HOUSE, St. Louis, Mo.